F.O.R. Fellowship

March, 1951 • Vol. XVII—No. 3 • 20 cents a copy—$2.00 a yea

Metamorphosis

Caught in a trap of pain, whose steely spring
Clutches and tears and holds the body fast—
Shall not the soul, serene and unharassed,
Lighten and share the load of suffering?
Lift the taut flesh above its travailing,
Teach it the fetters of its fear to cast,
Teach it to win its own release at last
Borne upward on the spirit's soaring wing?

So shall life shed its cramping husk of pain
And, from the broken husk, returned to earth,
The living germ again shall find release
In Nature's endless cycle of rebirth—
Life out of death, again and yet again,
Life out of death, and out of travail—Peace.

—CAROLINE FOULKE URIE

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Call Off the Cops! by Alfred Hassler

A Pacifism Adequate for Our Times, by George M. Houser

Freedom to Be Myself, by Fyke Farmer

Asia in the World, by John M. Swomley, Jr.

ff The Korean war, generally called UN police action, has aroused controversy, not least among pacifists, as to what police action is, whether this is it, and if so whether pacifists should support it. Alfred Hassler searchingly examines the basic principles of police action and how far the present war is from them, in *Call Off the Cops!* . . . Fyke Farmer, who has given up his profession to work full time for world government and peace, tells why he feels this is putting first things first. . . . George Houser is not, as some may think, a one-project man. His work in race relations is justifiably well known, but he is also an excellent field worker, and the organizer of last May's highly successful Conference on the Church and War. Here he delves into basic pacifist issues. . . . In response to an often-expressed need in the pacifist movement generally for good background-and-analysis jobs on world issues, John Swomley has done a cogent and fascinating one on the huge, overpopulated, vitally important continent of Asia.

FELLOWSHIP

Published by the

Fellowship of Reconciliation

21 Audubon Avenue
New York 32, N. Y.

A. J. MUSTE, *Secretary*

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE, *International Secretary*

ALFRED HASSLER, *Editor*

CONSTANCE MUSTE, *Assistant Editor*

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Vera Brittain
Margueritte Harmon Bro
Allan Knight Chalmers
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Elisabeth D. Dodds
Eugene Exman
Caleb Foote
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Wallace Hamilton
Erna Harris
John Haynes Holmes
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Milton Mayer
Alfred D. Moore
Ferner Nuhn
Kirby Page
Edith Lovejoy Pierce
Edwin McNeill Poteat
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman

FELLOWSHIP is published monthly except August. Re-entered as second-class matter July 1, 1947, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879; additional entry at Lebanon, Pa.

20 Cents a Copy $2 a year

Fellowship

the journal of the fellowship of reconciliation

March, 1951 Vol. XVII—No. 3

WHAT IS VALID POLICE ACTION? KOREA DIFFERS FROM IT BASICALLY, SO

Call Off the Cops!

By ALFRED HASSLER

WHAT IS NEEDED NOW, they say with wistful assurance, is a world police force. Without police, law is unenforceable, and without law, anarchy reigns and the criminal can terrorize society unhindered. Without world police, all the good intentions of the peace-loving nations accomplish nothing, and the aggressive, rogue nation can keep the whole world in a state of terror and suspense.

So they say, as the hunt for a reasonable way of preventing the plunge into the abyss takes on desperation. The forces that went into Korea with tanks and cannon and jet planes were "police"; the force of twenty or fifty or a hundred divisions the UN would like to consolidate from national contingents would likewise be "police." War might still be averted and aggression confined, they say, if only there were a world police force. . . .

The Semantics of Police

There are several things that need to be said about the use of the word "police" in this connection, things that are fairly obvious and have been said before but need to be said again.

The first of these is that *police legitimately operate only against individual lawbreakers or suspected lawbreakers.* There is no sanction in American law or custom for police to endanger the lives of innocent people, much less deliberately to do them injury, in the process of capturing or killing the lawbreaker. On the contrary, it is axiomatic in this country that it is better for the guilty to escape

punishment entirely than for innocent persons to suffer unjustly.

The resemblance of world police to this idea is entirely superficial. World police would operate against an offending nation, but it can operate against the nation only by visiting death and destruction on the individuals, innocent and guilty alike, who happen to inhabit it. The infant in arms, the rebellious citizen in the concentration camp, the bewildered, the ignorant, the helpless, all are as certain targets for the bombs and machine-gun bullets of the world police force as are the government officials and military officers who have instigated whatever "aggression" is being opposed. Indeed, past experience indicates that the active participants in creating conflict are frequently the last to be "punished," or even escape it entirely so far as human agencies are concerned.

Police Functions

The second clear characteristic of police is that *they are not charged with punishment, but with apprehension,* which is to be accomplished with whatever minimum of violence is required. Again it is axiomatic in American law that a man is innocent until proven guilty to the satisfaction of a jury of his peers. Even when police catch a man "red-handed" in the act of breaking the law, they are still required to bring him to court, where an impartial judge and jury will listen to his defense and consider whether there are extenuating circumstances to his offense.

Here the case for world police is slightly more ingratiating, but still is superficial and unconvincing on more careful examination. Thus it can be argued that while police are responsible for using as little violence as necessary, it is also true that they are justified in using as much violence as is necessary to take the criminal or criminals into custody, even to the point of machine guns and tear gas to subdue a gangsters' "hide-out." So it is argued that when the North Koreans deliberately and flagrantly violated the orders of the United Nations, the Security Council, having found them guilty of such violation, was justified in ordering "police action" to subdue the illegal aggression and bring its leaders to justice.

But such an analysis by-passes the facts that the Korean situation was a part of the over-all power struggle between East and West; that the *de facto* government of one major and vitally interested party to the dispute, China, was barred from participation in the United Nations; that another major power, Russia, was absent from the UN deliberations in protest against that exclusion; and that consequently the judgment was not made by an impartial jury but by what was in a very real sense an alliance of powers that was an interested party to the dispute.*

And this in turn leads to the third important characteristic of legitimate police: that *they operate by consent of the community or individuals concerned.* The police of New Jersey have no authority to operate as police in New York, and would themselves be subject to arrest if they attempted to do so. Similarly state police may not operate within organized municipalities unless invited to do so

* For a fuller discussion of this point see *Cops in Korea,* by Alfred Hassler (FELLOWSHIP, September 1950) and *Korea: Spark to Set A World Afire?,* by A. J. Muste. Fellowship Publications, 25c.

by local authorities, nor may national police (the FBI) operate anywhere except within the clearly defined limits of federal law. Police imposed on a community or people who have no voice in the decision to create the force become a repressive agency resented and opposed by the people over whom they have jurisdiction.

Only by Consent

Indeed, the significant fact about police is that they do operate by consent and only by consent. There are roughly 125,000 police officers of all kinds in the United States, of whom not more than 75,000 are on duty at any one time. To assert that 75,000 men keep 150 million people in order is patently absurd; what keeps the great bulk of the population law-abiding is its general acceptance of the law. When conditions arise that stimulate whole sections of the population to break the law, the police quickly lose control. In such case, if the government is wise it takes steps to correct the offending conditions; if it is not wise, it calls on its army to put down the "insurrection." It is not necessary to go to India for examples of such behavior: in our own Midwest during the depression irate farmers rebelled against wholesale mortgage foreclosures and literally prevented sheriffs and peace officers from carrying out eviction and seizure operations.

What makes this matter of consent especially relevant today is that whole vast sections of the world's population *are* in open revolt against the *status quo* and do not accept the authority of a "police" imposed upon them by an outside group. It thus becomes imperative for those who are seeking world law to choose between the wise course of attempting to correct the aggravating conditions and the unwise course of attempting to suppress an insurrection that comes close to being worldwide.

Actually, this is the nub of the problem. In one sense, whether the action in Korea or the proposed UN armed contingents are called "police" correctly or incorrectly is a matter of semantics and not of primary importance. What is important is the results that such a force may be expected to produce, whether it is called police or a security force or the Foreign Legion. Will such "police action against aggression" as the fighting in Korea help to strengthen the United Nations and lead in the direction of a genuine world order under law? Will it, at the least, serve to "contain" and discourage aggression and avert war? Is this the crude forerunner of a worldwide regime of law, under which world police would function as police legitimately should?

Here it becomes necessary to seek out the reality behind the sometimes reassuring words. It sounds impressive to say that 57 nations in the UN voted in a solid bloc to condemn the aggression of North Korea or of China, and that the vote against such action was only five or six, or even none. But when the 57 nations are recognized as including such tiny units as Costa Rica, Guatemala, Liberia, and so on, totalling all together only about 50 percent of the world's population, the picture is different. When there is added to that the fact that the world's second most powerful nation (at least) and the world's largest nation are either opposed or totally excluded, and that they with their allies total some 40 percent of the

world's population, most of the solid reassurance of the 57-5 vote has vanished. The truth of the matter is that in terms of power and population the vote is 1-1, with the UN split right down the middle.

No thinking about the international situation will be worth a pinch of snuff that does not begin with the recognition that overwhelming military and industrial power is now monopolized by two nations, the United States and the Soviet Union, and that these two are locked in a struggle for world domination.

This recognition has nothing to do with the question of which of the two is "right" and which is "wrong," or with the degree of rightness or wrongness of either, or with the relative desirability of communism or democracy, or communism or capitalism. However we wish the situation *might* be, realism requires that we recognize that this is the case, and that to a very great extent the United Nations is controlled by the Western bloc of nations and is therefore largely partisan in the struggle.

With this situation recognized, the question then becomes: Can a "world security force" that consists largely of the military might of the United States and the moral backing of some fifty other nations impose peace on the "aggressors," whose strength is the military strength of the Soviet Union and the potential of Communist China?

But it is doubtful whether this question can be answered adequately until we examine more carefully the nature of this "aggression" that must be contained. For as it would be physically realistic to expect a world army representing overwhelming force to be able to impose peace on a would-be aggressive Denmark, so it might be psychologically realistic to suppose that even an aggressive Russia might be deterred by the threat of even slightly superior force *if her aggression represented no more dynamic force than the word aggression implies:* that is, the desire to conquer for the sake of conquest.

The Trap

And this is the trap into which Americans are in danger of falling, if indeed they have not fallen already: to believe their own propaganda that the gains of world communism represent simply the fruits of terror, and secret police, and the lust for power on the part of a few men. The forces that move the masses of Asia today are revolutionary forces not unlike those that moved the American colonists of 1776. These people are stirring out of centuries of oppression and bitter poverty. They are no longer content with lifelong destitution. In a world that has shown itself capable of lifting a country's standard of living as high as America's has been lifted, they too want to rise.

As recently as fifty years ago, America was the hope of people with such aspirations. America welcomed news of revolutions; it supported and encouraged those who sought to overthrow tyrants.

Today America still talks about freedom, but it is freedom of speech and the ballot, and these are academic to the peasant who hasn't enough to eat. The same peasant who listens to the speeches about freedom sees the United States giving its aid to reactionary rulers like Chiang Kai-shek, Bao Dai, and Syngman Rhee, and he

thinks that actions speak louder than words. When the Russians took over North Korea in 1945, they began promptly to take the wealth away from the Japanese and the rich Koreans and distribute it among the peasants. When the North Korean army conquered South Korea last spring, it did the same thing. It is hard to tell a man who has been landless and destitute all his life, and who has suddenly been given a farm of his own, that the government that gave it to him should be resisted because it will also take away his freedom. Perhaps it will deny him freedom—he has never had much freedom anyway—but in the meantime it has suddenly taken real action to better his living standard, and this is an action too that speaks louder than words.

So our problem of world police, or a security force, comes down to this: There is an idea loose in the world, a dynamic, thrusting idea that speaks to the condition of the miserable millions who inhabit so much of the world's surface, and this idea, and the miserable millions' adherence to it, is what provides the strength behind what we call aggression. Can this force be contained, and *a willingness to abide by the status quo* be imposed by a security force, in order to secure world peace? To state the question is to answer it.

No "police" can manage such a task. If it is attempted, it must lead to war, as it already has done in Korea. The full-scale conflict may be postponed for a time, but it cannot be repressed for long by purely military means. Should such a war be fought, moreover, with the chaotic aftermath that is certain to follow a third global war, it will merely have spread farther the conditions out of which communism draws its strength.

What, then, is a realistic program for preventing war and arresting the spread of the tyranny and suppression that are the other side of the Communist program?

What Must We Do?

The only program that could possibly achieve such results would seem much less extreme to our forefathers than it will to our contemporaries: it demands no less than that America once again *take the leadership of the revolution!* It would require Americans to turn their backs on their recently-acquired faith in militarism as a panacea for all world ills. It would move them to compel their government to become again the spokesman for peace, calling in season and out for lifting the heavy load of arms off the backs of weary peoples. It would demand that America give up its bad habit of supporting any and every government that is anti-Communist, regardless of its nature otherwise, and embrace the cause of the oppressed wherever they are. Finally it would demand that the vast billions that now go into atom bombs and planes and radar nets be used to start at once the process of lifting the burden of poverty from the world—a sharing of the riches we have had with those who have been without for so long.

Such a program, with its continued emphasis on freedom and the dignity of the individual man, would have an appeal that soon would outweigh the appeal of communism. It is conceivable that the time is too late even for it to work; it is inconceivable that anything less can.

IN THE FACE OF THE PRESENT CRISIS
IT IS ESSENTIAL TO DEVELOP

A Pacifism Adequate for Our Times

By GEORGE M. HOUSER

WAR IS THE CRISIS of our day. First, our survival is at stake. When we are told by Harold Urey that forty million people could be destroyed in one night of bombing, when we know that all life within a radius of half a mile of the point of explosion of an atom bomb will be destroyed, and fifty percent of those persons within a radius of a mile and a half; when scientists now tell us that a hydrogen bomb one thousand times the strength of the bomb dropped on Hiroshima may soon be available; when we know that if we discover cures to diseases which have long plagued mankind, these cures will immediately become military secrets in order that the enemy may be at a disadvantage in bacteriological warfare—in all of this and much, much more we see the crisis of survival.

Second, we face the crisis of security. National security is the keyword in international politics. Yet at a time when we should feel more secure (according to militarist standards) than at any other period of our peacetime history, Americans suffer from fear, insecurity and panic.

The President's budget message for the fiscal year beginning in July calls for over $52 billion for our military preparedness program. We have the best equipped army in the world. Our navy is already larger than all the other navies of the world combined. We have a production potential that can outstrip that of any other country. Yet this preparedness does not make us secure, but only seems to deepen our fear. Telling expression of this fear lies in the spy scare, the loyalty oath program, the Communist trial, the deportation action against labor leaders with leftist affiliations.

A recent annual report of the American Civil Liberties Union is significantly entitled "In the Shadow of Fear." According to this report, our civil liberties have never been in such an endangered position as now. The F.B.I., although not becoming a gestapo, is frequently used as a kind of secret smear police. Government workers and teachers in particular, more and more are afraid to speak out on issues, take part in meetings that might be considered questionable, or be active in interracial or liberal organizations. Anything that is vaguely liberal is suspect. Thus are we seeing the crisis of security.

Third, we face the crisis of world order. The United States and Russia both are responsible for this crisis. The United Nations is helpless in the face of the power struggle of these titans. Both nations insisted on the veto in the Charter at

Dumbarton Oaks and at San Francisco. The United States has been by-passing the UN through its Marshall Plan, Truman Plan, and North Atlantic Pact. The United States very specifically by-passed the UN Trusteeship Council by refusing to place the formerly Japanese mandated islands under this body and even refusing the Council the right of inspection.

To talk in terms of world government as a political possibility while the problem of war is still not dealt with directly is illusion. Russia certainly would refuse to join any group of nations in a provisional world government now or in the foreseeable future. Even if it was assumed a large group of nations under the leadership of the United States would join in a limited world government now (an assumption which is probably not justified) this new government would face the decision of accepting or renouncing war and militarism as a means of maintaining security. Any decent democratic world order is an impossibility as long as the problem of war itself is not dealt with directly and decisively.

Finally, we face the crisis in terms of the preservation of values. If any particular standard is motivating people today, it is the very dubious standard of what is called "necessity." There is a new kind of political realism which pervades the thinking of people today. No longer is there much talk of preserving democracy by war or of war to end war. The new realism states that war can result at best in the negative value of defeating the enemy, and that there is no alternative to fighting violently anyway. War is the "unnecessary necessity." There is a growing cynicism toward institutions of religion and democracy.

When the church says that under certain conditions it is justifiable to use the atomic bomb, its political and military premise may not be questioned by many people, but since the church is supposed to accept a moral standard above the demands of "necessity," its spiritual right to express this position is challenged. It leads to cynicism. Cynicism is the sign of the growing degeneration of our age. People do not believe in anything deeply enough to follow it to the end. The doctrine of necessity ending in cynicism is the final expression of the crisis of war as we see it.

Strong Negative Case

It is much easier for pacifists to present a strong negative case than a positive one. We can make a conclusive argument that war is evil, that it destroys democracy and freedom, but putting too much emphasis on our negative case is one of the mistakes pacifists have made.

Another of our errors, however, is oversimplification of the difficulties of winning a nonviolent victory and solving the world's problems. Pacifists, as well as others, are looking for an easy answer. One expression of this is that we underestimate the evil of our opponents. On the part of some pacifists during the war there was a tendency to excuse the Nazis for the atrocities they committed, and to disbelieve that six million Jews were exterminated. Today we find pacifists who, for example, are excusing Communists for their atrocities or who do not believe we should publicly admit slave labor exists in Russia.

Another expression of our desire

for an easy answer is the tendency to overestimate the victory that can be won through good will. We assume too easily that an opponent will be converted through a ready smile and a handshake. We assume rather unquestioningly at times that sending food to Russia would effect changes in the totalitarian regime of the Communists. Many pacifists, when their eyes have been opened to the depth of evil in man and society, have responded (some who have seen the concentration camps in Germany, for example) either by disavowing their pacifist position, or by retreating from the struggle entirely on the assumption that pacifism is irrelevant.

What Is Basic?

A third expression of our desire for an easy answer is seen in our reliance on political action through disarmament and anti-conscription campaigns. We sometimes feel that we are doing the most essential work for our cause if for a brief moment a military appropriation bill is defeated in Congress. I do not mean to underestimate the importance of this kind of political action, yet we know that it is not pacifist arguments that can win such a political campaign. It must be the argument that conscription costs too much, that some military authorities feel it will not really defend us, etc. A basic pacifist education job must be more than this.

Further, from a pacifist point of view a purely political campaign against armaments can on occasion be misleading. Gandhi has been quoted as having said that it is better to resist violently than not to resist at all. Perhaps this opinion is open to question. Pacifists do not advocate no resistance to evil, but nonviolent resistance. Therefore, pacifists oppose militarism on the grounds it is both immoral and ineffective and that there is an alternative. If they are party to a campaign which undermines the only resistance methods which most people are ready to use and do not imbue them with faith in nonviolence simultaneously, they act partially in an irresponsible and dishonest fashion.

A final expression of our desire for an easy answer is seen in the world government movement. We are looking for a political panacea. A number of pacifists have either given up their position or have been putting major effort into world government work on the supposition that this is the only means by which a future war can be stopped.

We do not have space to enter into a full discussion of the world government movement here. Suffice it to say that there are a number of very serious problems which must be solved before any such movement can have a chance of success. The basic issue of violence and war, mentioned earlier in this article; the problem of national sovereignty, expressed in the UN by the veto; the necessity for getting all of the important nations into such an organization, vs. the possibility of starting with a few and "leaving the door open" for the others (usually mentioned in connection with Russia), are a few of the most important points.

World government is probably not a political possibility at the moment, and the movement built around this concept will surely collapse as war with Russia becomes more imminent.

These remarks are not meant to imply that we should give up our

faith in that of God which is in every man, or in the power which is inherent in good will, or in the necessity of political action on occasion, or in the necessity of some form of world government in the one-world community which is struggling to be born. Rather, these remarks are meant to imply that we cannot accept these ideas uncritically and unrealistically or as a substitute for the essential pacifist position.

There is no easy way out of the terrible crisis which faces us in the world today. We believe in the power of nonviolence, but we are a small minority, and we are not a political factor in the power struggle today. Our essential task is to convince as many people as we can of the power of nonviolence, to pattern our own lives after the way of nonviolence and reconciliation in our own daily contacts, to experiment with the power of nonviolence on an ever-widening scale in community affairs. Ultimately we have to reckon with the fact that we may not be successful in converting our friends or our opponents to accept our way. We must reckon with the fact of cruelty unabated by good will, invasion not stopped by reconciliatory measures. Our position finally rests on nonretaliation and the Cross in the face of evil and injustice. We may never be a power in the world, but only a witness; but our faith is that ultimate power, not in a political but in a religious sense, rests in this witness.

If this is true, then pacifism ultimately is a religious and not just a political position. Politics is concerned only with winning a victory and gaining power. Pacifism is not by any means unconcerned with power, but does not rest on winning it. The pacifist will give up power and life itself rather than compromise with his undergirding principles of love and reconciliation. A religious faith in something akin to what is symbolically expressed in the resurrection is therefore a necessity. Victory is not to be reckoned in political achievements, but in adhering, even very imperfectly, to ultimate truth.

Positive Program

Our positive and concrete program must be seen in the light of the above.

First, our task is educational—to convince an ever-widening group of the political possibilities and the moral and religious necessity of pacifism. This must be done as we work through the multitudinous organizations that make up our society—schools, churches, etc.

Second, on the political level we should work against armaments, conscription, and the spread of militarism, and should work toward world government with honesty and without illusion. We should not use anti-pacifist arguments in order to win a questionable political victory.

Third, we should be active in urging and supporting works of mercy—relief and rehabilitation in our own country and abroad.

Fourth, we should be active in opposing injustices in our own communities. We can gain experience in nonviolent techniques, and show the effectiveness of nonviolence as we participate in campaigns against racial, economic, religious, and political wrongs.

Finally, we should engage in civil disobedience activities—the most logical expression of our position in a world that is based on violence and militarism. Civil dis-

obedience activity clearly outlines the revolutionary implications of nonviolence in an aggressive world. As the power struggle between the United States and Russia intensifies, either a greater number of pacifists will give up the position, or they will recognize the necessity of non-cooperation with tax laws, conscription, and the other encroaching evils we must face or submit to. Our position is not based on a belief in law as such, but in principles above the law.

Reveille to Relevance

"Church numbers are going up while Church influence is going down!" Every year tabulations attest the former and quidnuncs the latter. Why?

Is it that our doctrine today is unsound, our theology shaky? No: Protestants have an exciting new concern for the Incarnation. Has the fire of evangelism gone out? No: visitation crusades this very year bring in astonishing numbers of new Christians.

Rather, faith seems to have lost its power to change the world, by agreeing to be happily *irrelevant* to the claims and crossclaims of daily life. Keep Christianity off the battlefield and you can enlist plenty of people for its colors. Keep it talking but not acting its creed, and it will continue to be popular—and insipid. Yet today as always, once let the Gospel become *relevant*, and—trouble!

For example: Try demonstrating Christ-given equality in race relations—and you will see most ordinary churchmen solidly walk out on you. As a Christian take politics seriously, and the better people will be downright embarrassed for you. Live out (with no word of preachment) even "trivial" disciplines about Sunday or drinking or tithing or smoking or petty gambling or swearing—and you will quickly receive your rating as at best a kindly fanatic. Clothe Christian fact in new functional art forms, and the Church will view them and you with a stony eye.

More: adopt seriously Christian simplicity, and townsfolk will tsk-tsk at your unfashionableness and penury. Claim your consumer co-op is a Christian economic answer, and every merchant 'round about will shudder that you're a subversive. Above all, practice affirmative Christian pacifism today, resisting the whole current hubbub of nationalistic heroics and the garrison state—and you will be hurried headlong from the aghast congregation of the righteous.

"Blessed are ye when men shall revile you and persecute you. . . ." This peculiar sort of blessedness most of us have never seriously encountered. It doesn't mean we invite persecution as such: being just out-of-step may take us nearer not to the Kingdom but to the psychiatrist's office. But it is written large in the skies today that Christian integrity—even while more and more millions murmur Lord, Lord—means simply doing those things, costly unpopular things, which He commands us.

Look at the Gospel and you will find it tragically and gloriously relevant, to the anguish and banality—and wistfulness—of our time.

—John Oliver Nelson
Kirkridge Contour

PUTTING SURVIVAL ABOVE PERSONAL GAIN, THIS MAN BELIEVES, WILL PRODUCE

Freedom to Be Myself

By FYKE FARMER

"A man should learn to detect and watch that gleam of light which flashes across his mind from within, more than the lustre of the firmament of bards and sages."

—EMERSON

Essay on Self-Reliance

MORE IMPORTANT, it seems to me, than the Four Freedoms of Franklin Roosevelt is one I would add as the Fifth, "The Freedom to Be Myself." I am convinced that most of our troubles would rapidly dissolve if every one of us would reject opinions that are dished out ready-made in the newspapers, over the radio and from the pulpit, and resolve simply to be himself.

Grasping for this freedom led me four years ago to give up my life's occupation, the law. For twenty-one years I had practiced law in Nashville, but I had reached the point where I could no longer serve two masters. To continue writing wills and contracts would mean to remain docilely a cog in a social, economic, and political machine relentlessly moving toward war, and that I could not do.

I chose instead to give all my time and energy to work for the creation of a People's World Constituent Assembly.

My wife and I talked it over. We decided that someone had to go to peace in the way that men go to war, leaving home, family and business. War demands the best steel, the best leather, the best wool, the best food—the best of everything. But with peace we all relax and make only the feeblest remonstrance against the stupid programs of governments to put us right back into another war. In devoting myself to world government I felt that I was doing the best that I could for my family. A father owes it to his children to give them a home, food, clothes and education, but he owes it to them to save them from being blown off the earth with atom bombs, too.

Many things had transpired to bring me to this conviction. When World War II came I was not a pacifist. In 1940, 38 years old and with a wife and four children, I registered.

But a young Methodist minister in Nashville refused to register. His name was Albert Ashley. He had a "good" church, large and old, with a middle-class membership.

Ashley got a prison term, and the Bishop removed him from his charge for "the good of the church." The incident created a commotion in Nashville, but Ashley was unmoved. I was impressed with the simplicity, courage, and manifest sincerity of his position.

Little more than a year later, I was asked to speak at the dedication of a chapel built by the Episcopal Diocese of Tennessee at Tullahoma, near the Army's Camp Forrest. The date was December

15, 1941, which had been set aside for national celebration of the 150th anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights.

After I had accepted the invitation, Pearl Harbor turned the country topsy-turvy, and the whole nation rallied itself for all-out war. What could I say in a Christian church in a military camp, in favor of the Bill of Rights to guarantee individual liberty in a republic in a time of national peril while a world-wide conflagration was raging?

Temporary Solution

For the first time I seriously pondered the problem of reconciling war with the life and teachings of Christ. I delved into the New Testament. Nowhere did it appear that Jesus had denounced the institution of war. He had scorn for the scribes and Pharisees, but none for the centurion who came to him. He refused to take the sword to defend himself in Gethsemane, but not once did he condemn war itself. Yet in the secret chamber of my mind I realized that modern war was in direct contradiction to his life and works.

After much soul-searching, I reached a conclusion that may have been a rationalization; certainly it does not deserve to be called a conviction. I felt no sense of guilt for the war. It seemed to me that nothing I had done had helped bring it on. As a nation we were in it up to our necks. If we could manage somehow to keep our heads, we could save for ourselves the opportunity to organize the world on a decent basis to prevent another such catastrophe. If we should fail to win the military victory, the world was sure to lapse into a state of barbarism in which love and the noble sentiments of humanity would be extinguished.

What really happened is clear. We did not use the peace to bring the nations together. We spurned law and order, relying on the means of mass destruction to "enforce peace." Korea is the result.

Today I am through with war. If I were of the age for military service, I would refuse to serve. I think I would do exactly what Albert Ashley did. I have a son, and I am trying to teach him to refuse military service.

I made my federal income tax return for the year 1949 when I had an abnormally large income, which I will probably never have again. I have not paid the tax and I cannot pay it. The government may make a levy on my home and everything I possess any day to force me to support war, but I am resolved not to become a voluntary accomplice in the crime of plotting and organizing the mass obliteration of the cities of Europe, Russia, and Asia, and the killing of countless millions of innocent men, women, and children with our stock of 700 atomic bombs and the even more powerful and destructive ones we are frantically endeavoring to build. In a nation gone mad, I am resolved to keep my own sanity.

Anyone who sincerely wants to see war eliminated must, it seems to me, take his stand for world government. This means more than lip-service. It means support for plans for the establishment of world government through the direct election of delegates by the people of all countries. It means rebellion against war, going over the heads of the statesmen, blind leaders of the blind, until we reach a stratum of common sense and

feelings for fellow human beings among the common people.

This is by no means a bed of roses, but neither is the course toward war a bed of roses. We are the captives of an impracticable and unworkable system. How can we escape?

It seems to me there is an interesting parallel between the idiotic system of war between nations to keep peace and the ancient system of *lex talionis* or blood revenge. Crude and undeveloped societies from the time of the Code of Hammurabi on down through the centuries yielded allegiance to the law of an "eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." This law was designed to prevent and suppress strife and violence. An injury to any member of one tribe or clan was a common injury to the whole tribe. Each member was under both a legal and a religious duty to avenge any death or injury his tribe had suffered. All of the members of the tribe of the one who inflicted the violence were subjects for that revenge.

While the certainty that retaliation would be suffered was doubtless some deterrent to crime, the system was a ludicrously ineffective one. It bred feuds. A quarrel once commenced led to endless and interminable disorders. The widow of Tekoah (II Samuel, Chapter 14) showed David the grave faults and absurdity of the system.

David Hume in his *History of England** traces the efforts of enlightened kings like Edmund and Ethelbert to contract and diminish these feuds by developing a more regular administration of justice. Reform came about as the result of the operations of conscience in individuals who dared "to defy the gibbet and the mob." By the Salic law, any man was permitted by public declaration to exempt himself from his family quarrels; but then Hume adds that he was by the law no longer considered as belonging to the family. He became an outcast beyond the protection of the society in which he lived. He was looked upon by his contemporaries as a coward, when the contrary was true. He was moved to take such a stand only from tremendous resources of personal courage. He was punished for his nonconformity by being deprived of all right of succession.

* Vol. 1, p. 182, Appendix I.

Even a Few Men

I do not expect (even as we plan civil defense against the effects of atomic bombs) that there will tomorrow be any mass revolt against war. But as the back of the system of blood revenge was broken when a few enlightened individuals refused service to the system, so the institution of international war will expire as a few men of moral discernment and conscience go in individual revolt against the system.

The Salic law allowed a man to declare publicly his freedom and immunity from the operation of the foolish system of blood revenge. The Nuremberg law today provides an avenue of escape for those who are strong enough to take it. The principle, upheld and enforced by the hanging of the Nazi war perpetrators, that the individual cannot shield himself from the consequences of his international crime by resort to the law of his national state, is the key. I claim the protection of that principle.

I claim immunity from being coerced into becoming an accom-

plice in the crime of organizing a criminal assault upon my fellow human beings with atom bombs and the other means of mass destruction. There can be no retreat from the advance made at Nuremberg. I do not recognize the power of the President, the Congress of the United States or even the Supreme national court to repudiate that principle and turn us backward toward the all-encompassing anarchy which another war would be.

I am willing to sacrifice material security for spiritual and inward peace of mind. I resolved at Tullahoma on December 15, 1941 to support war once more hoping good would come from it. Having proof from two world wars in my lifetime of less than fifty years that no good, but only a trail of greater evils, comes from wars, I am not willing to hazard support of a third.

I do not believe that the present war is an attempt to safeguard the freedom that is essential to human dignity and a decent existence. I believe that the only way to safeguard freedom and maintain human dignity is to follow the course that I have chosen. I believe that if all men will do as I am doing we can have a decent existence with human dignity for all. I believe that if I do as most other people are doing, taking the course of least resistance, hating Russia, the Reds, and Communists all over the world, worshiping the dollar and the vast material resources of America, and paying untold billions of taxes to be spent for world-wide destruction, I take the surest way to wipe out freedom and lower the survivors to a state verging on barbarism for years to come.

I am convinced that if others—not necessarily *all* others but *many* others, or even perhaps a *few* others—would do as I am doing we could save ourselves, our children and loved ones and assure the continuance of civilized life on this planet. That is a two-fold course:

(a) To practice noncooperation with the measures of the governments for war, by refusal to be conscripted or to render military service in any form direct or indirect, and by refusing the payment of taxes without which war cannot be financed and organized.

(b) To support with money and time the immediate creation of a people's world government on the plan of electing delegates to the People's World Constituent Assembly on the basis of one delegate per million population. The first concrete step toward this goal was taken when the people of Tennessee on August 3, 1950, elected their three delegates. The second step was taken at Geneva on December 30, 1950, when these three delegates met with several hundred members of parliaments, representatives of organizations and individuals from forty or more countries to stimulate action for the adoption of laws and otherwise arrange for the election of delegates to subsequent sessions of the World Constituent Assembly. When finally enough delegates are chosen—by the *people*—they will begin to formulate the constitution that will abolish war and establish world order by law.

And now I will end where I began. I want just to be myself, instead of a goosestepper in the national parade toward war. I hope many thousands of others will decide soon to be themselves and stop goosestepping, too.

News from the Peace Front

Second Prosecutions of COs Continue

Henry Standing, of Earlham, Iowa, was arrested in November for the second time, and arraigned on January 5. Trial will be in the spring.

Donald Mott and *Roy Knight* were arraigned January 4. They will be tried in the spring.

Amos Brokaw, who served sentences under the Selective Service Act of 1940 and that of 1948, was arrested and released on bond in November. He is not expected to be arraigned until late spring.

Stephen Simon of Indiana, who served a 90-day sentence in 1949 for refusal to register under the Selective Service Act of 1948, has been arrested and released on bond, and is expected to be arraigned in the late spring.

Carl E. Kime, of South Bend, Indiana, was sentenced to one year in prison on November 4 for refusal to carry a draft card. He was a nonregistrant, but had been automatically registered.

T. Vail Palmer, of Concordville, Pennsylvania, was sentenced to a year and a day on November 20 for refusal to register.

Paul and David Seaver, Pennsylvanians, have been arrested for nonregistration and freed on bond.

Ollie Sanderson of Alabama was arrested for refusal to report for induction and was freed on bond.

Robert Richter and *Robert Cannon* of California, who had been free on bond pending appeal, lost their petition for a Writ of Certiorari on December 5 in the Supreme Court. On February 1 they each began serving a three-year sentence.

Dr. Raleigh Pickard was arrested on February 6 for refusal to register for the doctors' draft, and released in $1,000 bail.

Alfred Dana of Carmel, California, was tried for nonregistration, and on February 7 was convicted and given a sentence of five years, in the court of Judge Murphy in San Francisco.

Orin, Joel, Paul and Sid Doty, four brothers from Bruno, Minnesota, between the ages of 20 and 24 years, were arrested in January for nonregistration.

Larry Atkins of Maryland and *L. Ebeling* of Arkansas have been arrested for nonregistration.

Gerald Counts of New Mexico has been arrested for failure to report for a physical.

Andrew Wurtz of Montana was arrested for refusal to submit to induction.

Aaron K. Yoder, of Jerome, Michigan, an Amish Mennonite, was convicted on February 1 in Detroit of refusal to report for induction. On February 16, in the court of Federal Judge Thomas P. Thornton, he was sentenced to five years in prison.

Donald Koch, 25, of Los Angeles, on January 22 was sentenced to four years in prison for refusing to report for induction.

Robert Wixom was granted parole on January 14, after it had previously been denied.

F.O.R. Leadership Training Set Up

The summer project outlined by the National Council at its meeting in December will have as its primary aim the training of young FOR members to take leadership in various ways for the pacifist movement. After three weeks of intensive study and preparation they will go out into the field to gain experience in various types of activity, providing leadership at summer camps and conferences, participating in poster walks and street meetings, speaking to church groups, and so on. They will then return to report on their experiences and discuss them with each other and with leaders of the pacifist movement, who can give them guidance.

The course will probably last for eight weeks, with three for study and preparation, three for training by doing, and two for re-evaluation and rededication at the end, starting after the middle of June and lasting till late August.

Hartmann Wins Academic Freedom Suit

Prof. George W. Hartmann, member of the FOR, WRL and Socialist Party and head of the ill-fated Peace Now movement during the war, which resulted in his dismissal from Teachers College of Columbia University in May, 1944, was vindicated in his fight for reinstatement in a decision of the New York State Supreme Court on January 23. The Peace Now movement, which aimed at uniting all possible elements on a simple anti-war program, received widespread and adverse publicity, and went out of business. Dr. Hartmann at that time was dismissed from his teaching position, but due to pressure from the American Association of University Professors, was reinstated the following year. However, he was forced to sign a waiver of tenure rights, and in 1949 when that contract expired Teachers College refused to renew it. After a two-day trial, during which the Court ruled that the defenses offered for the dismissal were insufficient, a settlement was arrived at under the prompting of the Court. Tenure rights were upheld, and T. C. agreed to pay Dr. Hartmann the year's salary he had lost, and the full costs of the litigation. Dr. Hartmann expressed his satisfaction at the establishment of the principle of tenure and academic freedom, but said that he did not expect to return to Teachers College. He is now teaching at Roosevelt College in Chicago.

Changes in CO Classification Made

A Presidential Order issued in January has changed the classification order for IV-E's so that it comes immediately after I-A and I-AO. This means that the CO is relieved of the necessity of appealing other classifications for which he may be eligible, such as II-A, III-A or IV-A. Instead he must now appeal a IV-E classification if he has other reasons for deferment, otherwise when the law is changed so as to draft IV-E's into some kind of civilian duty he will immediately be called up. For further information write to the FOR or to the Central Committee for COs, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia 3, Pennsylvania.

Students Act on World Issues

At the quadrennial conference of the Student Christian Association Movement, meeting in Oxford, Ohio, over the Christmas holidays, the students voted to make the problem of world peace their major emphasis for the next four years. The conference opposed UMT and UMS, supported COs, advocated "peaceful, nonviolent" methods of working for racial justice, and advocated a world order where "nations cannot use war as an instrument of national policy."

The conference was attended by about 1300 delegates from all over the country, and pacifism was one of the major issues discussed. A special meeting on pacifism, addressed by A. J. Muste and other FOR members who were present, was attended by 300 young people, in spite of the fact that it came after the end of a long afternoon session of the conference.

Senate Delays Sending Food to India

Because India continued to press for negotiations with China over the Korean war and refused to back up the United States' campaign to brand China an aggressor, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, of which Senator Tom Connally of Texas is Chairman, put off India's request for a loan of $200,000 to pay for 2,000,000 tons of our surplus grain to stave off literal starvation. Earthquakes and floods have reduced India's grain supply by about 6,000,000 tons, of which about 4,000,000 have been obtained from Canada, Australia and the Argentine by the Indian government. There is no source of supply for more except the United States, and the Indian workman's grain allowance of twelve ounces a day, which according to dieticians is about half what he needs, was cut back in January to nine ounces.

On January 25, the day after Prime Minister Nehru of India had criticized the U. S. attempt to brand China an aggressor and had said he was convinced China was eager to negotiate, the Senate committee referred the request for grain to a subcommittee which was to look into "the whole question of United States relations with India" before the grain request could be acted on. Senator Connally made it clear to reporters that prompt and favorable action were considerably lessened by Nehru's speech.

Protests went up from many sources at this outright political use of food, even the New York *Times*, which deplores Nehru's position, declaring in favor of the loan.

On February 9 President Truman proposed that the United States send 1,000,000 tons of grain as a gift to India, with the government of India providing transportation. The other million tons India needs, he suggested, might wait until Congress makes its investigation, and Congress seemed likely to approve the plan.

A Holy Week Vigil and Fast for Peace will be held at Kingwood Community, March 18-25. The program will include a continuous vigil during the day, periods of corporate worship and prayer, group reading and discussion and time for rest and individual study and prayer. Fasting may be partial or complete. For information or if you wish to participate write to Kingwood, Route 1, Box 72A, Frenchtown, N. J.

Children Plead for Peace in World

"We are members of a ninth grade church school class who believe that all people belong to the family of God," wrote a group of children from Hennepin Avenue Methodist Church in Minneapolis. "We are the generation of children who have never known peace." They sent the letter to their UN delegates, to the President, and to Communist representatives, and sent copies to some newspapers, many of which printed them. "Can't you forget your grievances and just decide among yourselves to make this a happy world for the children?" they wrote. "That ought to keep everyone busy for a long time to come. . . . Please remember the children while you are deciding whether or not to destroy the world!

"Please keep talking until you find some way to agree. Our parents tell us when we quarrel that no one is ever wholly right, and if each one admits that he was partly wrong then a right way can be found. Can't you do the same? Can't each country admit its mistakes and say 'Now we'll have to make a new start'? If it were possible we would like to come to Lake Success to assure the Chinese Communists that the children of America still care for the children of China. We do not want to see them suffer. Neither do we want to see the Korean children undergo any more suffering." The letter ended with an appeal to other children to clip out the letter, if they agreed with it, and send it to the Hennepin Church children or to the UN delegates or the President. Within a few weeks over 2,000 names had come in, and there was no way of knowing how many had been sent to the President or the UN. Minister of the church is Harold Ruopp, and the Sunday School teacher is Mrs. Ruopp, both FOR members. For information write to Mrs. M. J. Bell, Jr., 122 W. Franklin Ave., Minneapolis.

Stamm Accused as Communist Sympathizer

Dr. Frederick Keller Stamm, FOR member, author, minister and radio speaker, on a lecture tour through Colorado last October was charged with being a Communist sympathizer. Before he was to speak in Ft. Collins, one or more unnamed persons asked Congressman William S. Hill of Ft. Collins to get information about him from the House Un-American Activities Committee. The reply linked Stamm with a number of organizations that the Committee charged were Communist fronts, and the Ft. Collins Methodist Church and Council of Churches received telephone calls objecting to his speaking. As a result the Rev. Henry Weiss of the Methodist church referred the charges to the FBI and was informed that the FBI "had no record of Dr. Stamm belonging to any organization listed . . . as subversive or Communist front." Dr. Stamm made a special trip to Loveland, where the same trouble had cropped up, to talk with local ministers and lay people, and the objections were exploded. Shortly afterward the Ft. Collins Council of Churches went on record as deploring "the hysteria in our country and in our own county that permitted pointing the finger of suspicion without evidence at . . . Stamm."

Jottings

The FBI announced on January 12 that it had had 9,000 draft violation cases to investigate in the last six months of 1950, and that at the end of the year they were coming in at a rate of 2,200 a month.

* * *

Charles Walker, Philadelphia FOR Secretary, gave a series of three lectures on pacifism, the first in chapel, at which student attendance is compulsory, at Cheyney State Teachers College in Cheyney, Pennsylvania. The President of Cheyney, who is sympathetic to the FOR point of view and felt the students should hear it, had circulated the proposal among teachers in the Social Science Department and received hearty approval from them.

* * *

Contributions to the American Friends Service Committee dropped nearly a million dollars in 1950, making an income of $3,970,000.

* * *

The National Board of the American National Red Cross recently endorsed the proposal of its medical policy committee that the race of blood donors should no longer be recorded. There is no racial distinction in blood, and now there will be no way of telling, once it is donated, what the race of the donor was.

* * *

The Rev. R. D. Snyder, Portland, Oregon, FOR member, died on October 1. One of the first ministers in the Northwest to speak up for labor organization and other liberal causes, he was of invaluable help to COs in World War II, one of whom describes him as "a one-man bail fund raiser, encourager, adviser and host."

* * *

At the three-day conference of the American Historical Association in December, Military Police were stationed in full uniform to guard the military literature.

* * *

Five Montana draft boards have protested deferment of COs, one board resigning over the issue, and the Montana Senate on January 25 passed a resolution by 50 to 2 urging Congress to make COs subject to military service, either combatant or noncombatant.

* * *

The salary of FOR member and tax resister Zoe Baur of Ephrata, Washington, has been garnisheed to collect $50 due on her 1949 Federal income tax.

* * *

The FOR took in 610 members during 1950, as compared with only 545 in 1949.

* * *

The new National Council of Churches has authorized its representatives to testify at Congressional hearings in support of guaranteeing the rights of COs in any universal military service law.

* * *

The Catholic Committee of the South, at its mid-century convention in January, adopted a resolution deploring segregation and urging "the ultimate integration of all members of the Roman Catholic Church."

Peace Personalities Abroad

Canadian Church Discusses War Attitudes

The General Council of the United Church of Canada recently adopted a report in which three alternatives were offered the Christian faced with war:

(1) "To identify himself with his fellows in the war effort;

(2) "To witness against the sins that lead to war by withholding support of the war and substituting efforts at reconciliation and relief;

(3) "To oppose his country's policy when he believes it to be wrong."

Dr. E. M. House of Toronto declared that there was no doubt as to the right of a man to oppose war if his conscience troubled him.

"And take the consequences," the Council secretary, Dr. Gordon Sisco, added.

India's Need for Food Desperate

The desperate need of India for food is underlined by FOR-member Richard Keithahn in a recent letter.

"At M——— we found people eating a root dug from the bottoms of dried-up irrigation lakes. They explained, 'The root is boiled three or four times, the water poured off. Then it won't poison us.' At C——— we found people eating parts of the cactus plant to be found in nearby hedges. At V——— we talked about the new drinking well they are helping us to dig. It is the first protected water supply they have had. Their pride kept them from admitting food difficulties. After pressure they acknowledged they were eating roots and cactus plants. Finally they even brought sawdust from one of the houses. People had gone to the nearby hills, cut a tree that is supposed to have inner wood that is good to eat, and were cooking it into a gruel. One said quietly, 'Two of our children died since we started eating this kind of food.'"

Keithahn continues: "A local British-owned mill gives to its Manager-Director thousands of rupees as a yearly bonus. Most of his mill-workers receive wages less than 1,000 rupees per year. . . .

"In villages in this area there are people in such dire need, because of the failure of rain, that they are selling themselves for 40 and 50 rupees per year. This kind of exploitation we cannot nor shall we tolerate. Cannot you understand that the capitalist democracy with its exploitation pattern suits us no better than a communism carried on by a dictatorship? We must have a 'casteless, classless society' by means of Love and Truth. Are you and I doing enough about it? . . .

"We must start in our own villages tackling the problems of race, exploitation, violence there. If we would strive to bring our standards of living down to a world standard and share the surplus with efforts for a just world—if we would refuse to buy the articles of exploitation and develop local industries of greater social responsibility—there are hundreds of things to do! We would be laying the foundations of peace. . . .

"Recently I had an air letter from a small group in southern

California who want to do more about the Korean situation. I wrote them to start 'true communities' in the USA as we have our Gandhian cells in India. These will have peace units and will soon grow into cells of even world significance which can cooperate with similar groups in other countries."

F.O.R. Member Refuses Loyalty Oath

This year all teachers in the California school system, as in many others, were required to sign a loyalty oath, and Mrs. Arthur Graves of Porterville refused. She had been teaching for two years, but she and her husband, who are FOR members, had lived in Porterville for 25 years. When the oath came up, "in keeping with all my thinking, feeling and experience, I refused to sign it," she said. "I knew nothing about it, but sensed a ghastly threat to something priceless in our American heritage. Eight of the ten teachers in our school felt the same sense of dread, but signed to save their jobs. . . . The Board of Trustees agreed with the Superintendent's suggestion that I be allowed to continue teaching as long as I cared to do so, without salary or expenses of course. If and when I chose to quit, no other teacher would be hired in my place, the principal of the school to take the class—the hope being that the law would be found unconstitutional and I would be reinstated. . . . So far there have been no objections, to my knowledge. I am secretary of our school PTA and all of the officers and many of the parents have shown approval. I attribute this tolerance so far to the fact of our long residence here, and to the exceptionally fine attitude of the school administrators."

Korean Urges Food, Not Bombs

Dr. Channing Liem of Korea, now Professor of Political Science at the Pennsylvania College for Women, writes:

"I submit that the best way to victory in Korea is, first, assuring the Koreans that their wants will be satisfied, and, second, by dropping all over Korea, not bombs, but the things the poverty-stricken Koreans can use. Let the UN try this for one month and I am sure it will prove most effective. . . . The acute poverty of the Korean people did much to invite the crisis. For centuries the Koreans have suffered greater economic hardships than any other peoples, first at the hands of their own tyrannical monarchs and then under the Japanese overlords. . . . What the Koreans want is independence and economic livelihood."

Trocme's Daughter Marries U. S. Doctor

Nelly Trocmé of Versailles, France, daughter of European FOR Secretaries André and Magda Trocmé, was married to American FOR-member Dr. Henry Blackburn, Jr., of Miami, Florida, in January. They were married in the Protestant Reformed (Huguenot) Church of Versailles, with André Trocmé officiating. They met in Cuba in 1949 when each was doing social work there.

Dr. Blackburn is now head of the United States Public Health Service unit in Austria.

Books

Hope for the Future

All Things Common, by Claire Huchet Bishop. Harpers, 1950. 274 pp. $3.

When one of the charter members of the cooperative community I live in died recently of polio, there was a spontaneous move on the part of the other forty families to join in extending help, financial and otherwise, to his widow and their two young children.

On the heels of this neighborly impulse came a second: to set up a memorial to the dead member in recognition of all he had meant to the community. Suggestions were made that his name be attached to a community road, or to the projected playground or community house, and these were referred to a committee. But the committee came in with another plan: a "memorial fund," to which all members would be asked to contribute a fixed amount weekly, and which would be available to help any member, by loan or gift, who ran into personal calamity. The suggestion was adopted unanimously.

So far has an American middle-class cooperative come from its initial hopeful but only timidly revolutionary idea of a group of families cooperating to develop a piece of land and build homes into a community that would be pleasantly rural, democratic, interracial and nonprofit. Now the slow ferment of concern for each other's welfare that starts when people work together for a common goal has led to a spontaneous desire to accept more responsibility for one another.

It has been the watching of this slowly developing ferment among families of widely varying political, religious and vocational backgrounds, seeing the growing sense of community collide with concepts of society so deeply ingrained as to seem immutable, that makes Claire Bishop's book so exciting to me. For here is a story of communities scattered across western Europe that are built on a conscious acceptance of the full implications of this principle of mutual responsibility.

The Communities of Work about which Miss Bishop writes are the most hopeful thing I have read about in many a moon. Driven by what must be, after two devastating wars, a much clearer recognition than most Americans have of the basic failure of capitalism to develop the "whole man," and unwilling to wait for the coercive, depersonalizing collectivism of government action, these communities are equalitarian, voluntary, and good-humored. All three are important.

What makes the communitarian idea seem so hopeful is the balance that Miss Bishop finds throughout the movement between the economic and the spiritual.

The Communities of Work are organized around a farm or vineyard or factory, and they try frankly to make their production as efficient and financially successful as they can. But production is not the be-all and end-all of life, and success is not to be achieved at the cost of exploited, depersonalized workers and their families.

Returns from the community's production—"wages"—do not go exclusively to the men who operate the machines or till the fields, nor are they divided on a mathematically equal basis. Instead, the community "rates" its members on their contribution to the "wholeness" of life.

Boimondeau, for instance, organized around a watch-case factory, rates all its members "professionally" and "socially"—the former on the basis of the efficiency and responsibility of their work; the latter on their contributions to the spiritual and intellectual life of the community. But Boimondeau defines as "work" things that would turn an American manager's hair white. Housewives are workers, for example, and are credited for their work. Children have the "work" of growing, sick persons have the "work" of getting well, and are credited with "points" and paid accordingly.

Another industrial community in France rates its members on the basis of professional activity, intellectual activity, moral activity, family setup, communitarian activity, and "adversity," with a maximum set for each category. It is significant that the maximum for "moral activity" (frankness, good behavior, courage, temperance, good example, selflessness, friendliness) is 300 points; for "communitarian activity" 400; while for "professional activity" it is only 150.

Some of the Communities of Work are Christian, organized by groups of Protestants or Catholics who wanted to see the "whole gospel" applied to life, and this is mightily encouraging in the shadow of an organized Church that has given itself so largely to be a willing slave to an unChristian society. (One Chief of Community was an evangelical minister who became "just tired of talking every Sunday." "For him, a Community is the modern form of the church. Sermons do not amount to anything. The big industrialist who attends them and professes to be Christian is no different from the pagan big industrialist. Either he does the same exploiting of the workers, or else he turns paternalist, doing everything for the workers, even sharing profits, everything, short of giving up private ownership, which is the Roman Empire conception of ownership but not the Christian one.")

Other equally successful communities are more heterogeneous, including religious and nonreligious, Communists and Socialists and MRP and Radicals, all working together harmoniously, and this is surely a very bright ray of light in the gathering gloom of a world divided more and more angrily by the process of labelling and pigeonholing men on the basis of opinion or association.

Well, I cannot report the contents of the entire book in a review, even one so long as this, but I can commend it to FELLOWSHIP readers who are struggling with the problem of how to arrest the plunge of modern society to destruction. The communitarians doubt that it can be arrested: they believe it is only

possible to build. In the words of the "declaration of principles" of the Societé La Drac-Severaisse:

"We have decided to leave this torn-away, disorganized, rotted world in the hands of those who are trying to halt its destruction. We have resolved to construct quietly, without publicity, a healthy living cell, in order to bear witness to other men that it is still possible to live and to build."

—ALFRED HASSLER

In Brief

In the Direction of Dreams, by Violet Wood. Friendship Press, 1949. 176 pp., $1.50.

A collection of eleven stories of young people doing volunteer service in Chicago and Europe, Kansas and Mexico, Texas and Puerto Rico. Covers students-in-industry, manual work projects, interracial projects in the South, and many others. Excellent for high school age and younger.

—C. M.

Unconditional Surrender, by Kirby Page. Pub. by the author, 1949. 32 pp., 15c.

Nationalism and communism, each of which demands a total commitment from its adherents, are the chief rivals today of Christianity. The author points out that although so many fail to live up to it, Christianity, too, "demands everything of the individual," and only by surrendering to this demand and taking Christianity seriously can we hope to abolish segregation and war and achieve the other ideals we cherish.

—C. M.

POOR

Al Hassler!*

Ever since he came to work for the FOR, practically, Ruth Steenburgh's been his secretary. She knows all his whims; the way he hides important manuscripts in out-of-the-way corners, how to get him out of a crying spell when there's been some criticism of *Subheads,* which drawer of his desk he keeps the Hershey bar in. And now she ups and gets married!

Poor Al! *She* leaves April 20; *he* leaves April 27.** And before he goes he's got to find a new secretary. She should be able to take dictation and type, file (and find what she's filed), answer letters on her own, cut out proof and paste it up, and be bright enough to help with editorial problems but not so bright as to give Al an inferiority complex.

She starts at roughly $33 a week take-home pay, gets free hospitalization insurance, plus three weeks vacation (after the first year), with $50 increase in salary yearly. In his own interest Al says, "I'm 5'8", weigh 153 pounds, have brown hair and eyes, and my friends say I'm pretty."

Write, wire, or phone *now,* to

Alfred Hassler
Fellowship of Reconciliation
21 Audubon Ave. New York 32, N. Y.

* Who *is* Al Hassler? Why, *he's* editor of FELLOWSHIP!

** Al's going to Europe for a while, at the request of the *American* FOR. The idea is to give Al a look at Europe, and Europe a look at Al. Practically nobody entertains any hope that he'll straighten things out over there.

Letters

The Rude Word

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

I spent the most unhappy Christmas I ever remember! Truman's ill-advised remarks on the atomic bomb simply poisoned Christmas for my English friends. I spent a lot of time writing to calm their fears. Here are a couple of examples: "We feel as if we were living over a volcano." Another "*surely* Truman didn't mean what he is reported to have said?" The comments of a third are worth quoting at length: "I am sending you a copy of a letter I wrote to the *Listener* (the B.B.C. weekly) which to my surprise they published in full." She goes on to explain that she was protesting the broadcast of someone who complained of the "defeatism" of the European peoples "because he found them lacking in enthusiasm at the prospect of another war! The rearming of Germany is appalling, but it is possible they have over-reached themselves there. There is, I think, a strong undercurrent of bitter feeling which may force itself to an outlet. The memory of German bombs has not faded all that much." She goes on, "did you see or read about the *Express* cartoon? Small boy writing in chalk on the pavement. Sister calls out to mother at window, 'Oo Mum, Cyril's wrote a rude word!' Cyril's word is PEECE! I wonder they didn't censor the Christmas Carols—Christ the Prince of XXXXX."

They have all had more than they can take, and the sooner people over here realize that the better. It requires no special training in psychology to know that we are dealing with whole populations of shell-shocked individuals, who simply cannot "take" one single thing more. So much for my Christmas!

My wishes for the new year are, may saner counsels prevail, and may it not be as bad as we think it will be.

ETHEL M. LUCE CLAUSEN
Rochester, New York

Question from Japan

(This letter to a missionary society is reprinted in FELLOWSHIP *with their permission.)*

Dear Sir:

I am thank you that I received a book "Making Everybody's World Safe" on 11th October.

It shall be make me a good man who can understand not only English but also that the basic thought of the United Nations is Christianity.

I think it is true that the basic thought of the United Nations is Christianity. However I cannot understand just one point of action of the UN, that is they have the UN forces. It seems to me very funny, because if the basic thought of the UN is Christianity. Why they killing another human who don't believe God with the name of UN? Today what is happen in Korea? I believe it is great sin to kill another human even if they don't believe in God, because we were made son of God by God. So we all human one brothers and sisters each other. I cannot understand Christianity without this thought.

It would be impossible to build lasting peace in whole world if we should not believe that thought.

It made me very sad that "Making

Everybody's World Safe" never said that to kill human is great sin.

You have to add as following articles:

"War should bring to kill human each other.

To kill each other is the greatest sin."

It is not enough that "Making Everybody's World Safe" said just only the cause of war.

However I am very young so if my opinion had mistaken please correct and show me.

Allow me that I wrote this letter with my very poor English and young my opinion.

I pray that you will get success to build eternal peace of whole world, give us power for build your heaven on this world.

TOSHIO NAWA
Hiroshima, Japan

On Sociology

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

Although T. F. Hoult, whose article on sociology and pacifism appeared in the October issue, joined a church, it appears that his interest in sociology far outweighed his interest in Christianity. That was unfortunate.

He speaks about methods of action being so powerfully entrenched in cultures that when they are challenged too directly, they do not change, as pacifists hope, but become more hardened and set in their ways. It would be well to note that military force is about as direct a challenge as is possible, that military minded people hope to make changes by its use, and that the latter have had many disappointments. The success of physical force is no more sure than is that of soul force.

Mr. Hoult says that pacifists would find that "appearing to 'go along' with a system, using subtle pressures only, has been found to effect far more radical and long-lasting changes than have direct challenges." It would be interesting to see national military organizations appearing to "go along" with the system of an opponent, and using subtle pressures only in its relationships. But as for Christians, we are supposed to refrain from evil and not compromise with it. If this should lead us too to the cross, it is a good indication that we are led by Christ rather than by sociology.

He says that pacifists examine the Indian results, but remain unaware that it was the culture of India, as well as that of her foe, and these alone, which made her successful in her pacifist struggle. Maybe he has forgotten that the culture of the foe, Britain, is well spotted with blood shed for imperialism (including that of many comparatively innocent freedom-loving people).

Mr. Hoult cites certain African tribes as examples of the feasibility of alternating between democracy and dictatorship without getting stalled on dead center in the latter. He seems to think that pacifists neglect to take into consideration differences in culture. Maybe he thinks the differences in culture between American and European peoples on the one hand and certain African tribes on the other is negligible.

Mr. Hoult in answer to the pacifist contention that idealistic methods would win over violence in the long run states "But who can say, if he be objective, what will actually happen in the long run." At the bottom of the same page he admits that a program of using force may well lead to disaster. So who can say that force will succeed for our side in the long run or even the short run? According to him cultures must be dealt with in at least an approximation of their own values if there is to be any hope of success. But just how low will we stoop to conquer and/or defend? Is there no morality except that fixed by the enemy? If so, the enemy has won the initial round.

The assertion that "We and our chil-

dren live in the short run and it is only this we can know for certain" may be good sociology but it is not good Christianity. Of course if we do not believe in a hereafter, reason will lead us to the conclusion that it is better to be a living devil than a dead saint.

"War leads to war," says the pacifist. "So does slavery," says the sociologist. Mr. Hoult implies here that there is a choice between only war and slavery. That is not so.

He says that "The future will care for itself if we can but control the present." As a result of past mistakes we do not control the present. This leaves the future's taking care of itself an uncertainty.

HARANO E. CHILDS
Winchester, Va.

Broadened Trend Good

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

It has been a cause of profound satisfaction to me to note the broadened religious trend which your little journal portrays. It seems to me to indicate that the pacifist movement may be developing a more mature measure of philosophic and religious understanding. Such a trend is gravely needed at this time.

I have watched the development of religious liberalism for more than 35 years and I have been convinced for a considerable time that religious reconstruction, to be decisive and realistic, must find expression largely outside of institutional circles. I am not saying that organized religion is a total loss, but I believe that the Church, generally speaking, lacks both the vision and the will for tackling many of the basic issues which endanger our spiritual and social life today. I believe that Kermit Eby is essentially correct when he says that "Protestantism is dying and does not know it."

It is to be earnestly hoped that liberal religious forces throughout America and the world can muster their energies in the prosecution of a soundly oriented program of spiritual and social renewal. In a revolutionary and transitional situation such as we face today, palliatives and superficial remedies will only serve to push us deeper into the abyss of social disintegration. Those who see beneath the surface of things know that organized religion is not likely to play a decisive role in any broad program of reconstruction. The church is too deeply intrigued with its middle class and traditional illusions to rise above its present dead-level of intellectual and spiritual mediocrity. On this point there should be little confusion among pacifists and liberals who know their history and who have a broad understanding of the basic issues underlying the present crisis.

Positive, informed and realistic action is surely needed and FELLOWSHIP seems to me to be well on the way toward the development of an enlightened and vigorous point of view.

JOHN H. BATES
Milwaukie, Oregon

Stagnating Pacifists

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

Although a few individuals are becoming more and more active in the cause of peace, I note a tendency in the majority to stagnate. My Webster dictionary defines "stagnate": "(1) To be or become motionless: hence to become impure or foul by want of motion. (2) To be or become dull or inactive."

I think these are good definitions for the attitude of many pacifists. They have worked in the past, but now, when they see the growing tide of propaganda aimed at those who even mention Christian virtues such as love and understanding, and even more, the idea of resistance, they seem to have given up and are acknowledging themselves defeated by the forces of evil in the world.

The cause for this given by some people is that the pacifists have been too radical and have thereby antagonized the majority; that a gentle middle course of propitiation and compromise of their ideals was a wiser course to pursue; that they would thereby almost imperceptibly lead their opponents to see the light through seeing the lives of those who live by that light.

The cause given by other people for the tendency to stagnate is that the pacifists have not been radical enough. I am of this opinion. In the early days of Christianity when the followers of Jesus were hunted and persecuted, and many of them died for their ideals by refusing to fight, the group was very much alive, though small. There was no compromise in those days. They did not say: "It is all right for *some* of us to kill under *certain circumstances*." They did not court imprisonment and death, in fact they met secretly in obscure cellars. But when confronted with the decision between killing or being killed, they chose the latter and took the consequences.

Today in this country the pacifists are confronted with a different decision. They may have to face imprisonment, but so far not death.

Other pacifists, not subject to the draft, are faced with the question between paying for murder, through taxes, or refusing to pay for murder, whether directly, as an individual, or indirectly through the withholding tax.

Jesus readily recognized the weak spot in a person's character. When the weak spot was "possessions" he told the man to "sell all." He did not have to tell everyone that.

Today we are not even asked to sell our possessions. We are asked to be willing to have 6 percent added to a tax which the official will take from our bank. This 6 percent pays for each man's testimony against war. But the majority turn away—not even sorrowful. Many ministers and organizations have looked upon their work as being so valuable "in the right direction" that they feel it unwise to jeopardize their position by attempting to lead their members against the mandates of government.

The pacifist organizations feel that way. They feel that their work would stop if they had to give up their offices because of refusing to withhold taxes from their employees. Could they not meet in somebody's house or cellar or attic or barn as the early Christians did? Would they not, through such testimony, strengthen the value of their work? Would they not make stagnation impossible? Movements such as Christianity, or today, communism, thrive best under persecution.

The practical pacifist, the pragmatic pacifist, the integral pacifist, the relativist—those who say "We all want peace, but it isn't as simple as that"—all these are only half-pacifist. It *is* just as simple as that—period.

VALERIE RIGGS
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Future Security

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

It was not enough, two years ago, for me merely to bestow upon my first-born the name Jeffrey Arden, because it meant "a fervent and sincere lover of peace."

If my son is ever to grow old enough, in this war-ridden world, to know and desire peace, then I must work and sacrifice *now* for peace—and I feel so ineffective, and know that I do so little toward that end.

But one thing I feel strongly: contributions to the FOR give far greater promise for the future security of my children than life insurance. So here is my contribution—I wish it could be much more.

DOROTHY J. MOCK
Washington, D. C.

Asia in the World

By JOHN M. SWOMLEY, JR.

For centuries, when Americans talked about international relations, they have meant Europe. Spain, England, France, Germany and the other European countries have played their part in the culture of America, and it is with Europe in mind that American foreign policy has been shaped. Now, however, the eyes of the world have turned East, and Americans see with surprise and resentment and sometimes repugnance the rise of the enormous, backward, awakening Chinese nation, of India, and of the other Asiatic countries. These downtrodden, uneducated, unskilled peoples are emerging from the darkness of centuries of oppression, starvation and ignorance, and their eager embrace of violent nationalism and anti-white feeling stems directly from this.

The panorama of Asia's history, with the new significance of events that are taking place there today, it is important for pacifists and peacemakers to understand. FELLOWSHIP *here presents an article surveying the background of Asia, and what has brought her to this place in history. Other such background material will be included in* FELLOWSHIP *from time to time on various aspects of our world.*

ASIA IS IN international politics to stay. It is no longer a distant land easily kept subordinate to Western colonial powers. As the world's largest continent it is asserting its right to speak for the more than half of the world's population who live there.

For centuries Europe, which is less than a fourth of Asia's size, dominated the political life of the Far East. The British held India and Burma, the French Indo-China, the Dutch Indonesia, and a combination of great powers divided the vast prize that was China. This European dominance had its roots in Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch and English trade as early as the 14th and 15th Centuries. Following the traders came the missionaries and then the military. In the 18th and 19th Centuries European and American powers began in earnest the larger economic and military ventures that made China and most of her neighbors satellites or colonies of the West.

Before this Western influence became dominant, the culture of the Far East (except for India) and hence to a real degree its politics, were largely Chinese. Certainly Korea, Manchuria, Tibet, Mongolia, Formosa and Indo-China were under the influence, and at times the rule, of China. Japan, although earlier it had been influenced by China, from 1638 until 1854 followed an isolationist philosophy and had very little contact with the outside world.

The period of colonial subjection witnessed increasing unrest in Asia. Resentment of foreign exploitation, nationalist stirrings, and sheer poverty and hunger all played their part. The First World War weakened and the Second World War destroyed the ability of the West to maintain virtually unchallenged control in the East.

Gandhi's successful leadership in India had its impact throughout Asia, as did, in a different way, the Far Eastern strategy of the Communist Party.

Vestiges of Colonialism

Only the vestiges of European colonialism remain. Today the really dominant powers in the Far East are India, China, Russia and the United States. Russia's influence comes through the Communist parties in China, Indo-China and other countries, as well as direct control of Siberia, Manchuria, and other Asiatic countries. The United States holds dominant economic power in Japan, the Philippines and what is left of the European colonies.

Far Eastern international politics today is therefore an amalgam of China's attempt to recapture leadership and control in the Orient, India's desire to see Asia free from domination by any power, Russia's determination to exercise practical control of Asia's destiny, and America's equally strong interest in the Far East, together with her determination to prevent Russian hegemony in Asia. Caught in the jaws of the resulting power struggle, the common people of Asia have famine and war added to their misery, and are dying by millions.

Any attempt to discuss the Far East must include four factors that run like threads through the fabric of Asia's history.

The first is famine. Famine has often set the stage for revolution, and is a centuries-old problem in lands like India and China, which suffer from droughts, floods, and inadequate facilities for the storage, transportation and distribution of food. China had in the winter of 1949-50 one of the worst, if not *the* worst, famine in her modern history. Thousands died, and more than 50,000,000 persons suffered, and as a result malnutrition will continue to be both a Chinese and a world problem. The famine was a result of drought in the north and floods of the Yangtze and Yellow Rivers. Not in a hundred years had both big rivers flooded simultaneously.

During the pre-war years China had to import about two million tons of food annually to supplement her own production. This year's food production will be about twenty percent under the pre-war yearly average of 141,000,000 tons.

India's Famine

India is also subject to devastating famines. Last year's need was desperate, but this year's outstrips it. The past summer's terrific earthquakes sent rivers roaring out of their courses through the rich grain basin of Bihar. Drought followed the floods; and in the south the monsoons failed for the third year to bring rain.

In Korea, as a result of the war, food supplies plus all expected relief shipments will provide only about ninety percent of the normal food supply in 1950-51. The rice harvest was thirty percent under normal. A problem quite as serious as famine is the shortage of wood and the difficulty of keeping the Korean people warm during the winter months.

The second factor of major importance to the Far East is colonialism and imperialism. The long history of foreign rule in India, Korea, Indo-China and other countries, plus the Western powers' exploitation of China, has intensi-

fied nationalism in Asia and kindled the desire to be free from the overlordship of the West. Asia has been responsive to Russia and to Communist leadership in proportion to Russia's championing of her revolt against the West. Despite the significant freeing of India and the Philippines, Asia still suffers from Western imperialism and the memory of it. The Dutch did not easily yield independence to Indonesia. The French are fighting and killing in Indo-China, Americans have enormous holdings in the Philippines, and dominate her economy, Britain still retains Hong Kong and Malaya, and Japan, Okinawa, and other Asiatic islands are thought of as military allies or bases for the West in its struggle with Russia.

The United States is singled out for attack by the East not simply, as the press would have us believe, because of Soviet propaganda and Asiatic Communist leadership, but because the United States is increasingly the bulwark of Western imperialism. The United States, while refusing to share surplus food with famine-stricken Asia, is sending military aid to France, Britain, and Holland without which they could not maintain their Far Eastern empires. Moreover, no politically wise Asiatic regards the Philippines as independent when the United States has military bases there and financially supports a government that continues to refuse to put through desperately needed land reforms.

A third factor is war. The people of the Far East have spent too much of their lifetime and their resources in war. Most of Asia, except India, Pakistan and Siam, experienced war on one side or another in World War II. They felt war's impact again in the revolution that swept the Chinese Communists into power, in the revolution in Indonesia, the uprisings in the Philippines, the wars in Korea and Indo-China. Asia does not therefore look hopefully upon the military might of the West as a liberating influence. It sees the military strength of the West as a threat from imperialist countries, and is conscious of the atomic destruction in Japan and the more recent devastation of Korea. If democracy's answer to the problems of Asia continues to be a military one she is certainly doomed to lose Asia.

China Is Important

A fourth factor is the importance of China. To a large degree China is Asia, and her only real competitor in population, resources and cultural influence is the Indian subcontinent. It is wishful thinking to believe that any power as far away as Britain, France, or the United States can oppose the will of China in Asia by controlling peripheral territory like Korea, Japan, Indo-China or Malaya. Likewise, all of these and other Asiatic lands must for their existence trade with China and maintain relations with her. If China cannot be influenced to become a peaceful, independent and democratic member of the family of nations, there is little hope that her smaller neighbors will escape the ideological and cultural influences that dominate Chinese political life. In other words, any program designed to bring peace and freedom in Asia must deal chiefly with China.

Asia, like almost every other continent, is divided into different nations whose history and role in the present power struggle must be

examined as separate units if the problem of the whole continent is to be seen in perspective.

China

China's recorded history begins about 1500 B.C., and is a story of great dynasties, expanding empire, the development of art and philosophy, revolt against an ancient feudal system, political divisions, and conquest. China very early achieved a high degree of culture. Long before the 10th Century A. D. China had built a great canal through the heart of its north central areas, established civil service examinations for government positions, achieved a real degree of religious tolerance, developed architecture and sculpture to a point of excellence and invented block printing.

In the 13th Century China and most of her neighbors were overrun by the still barbarian Mongols, who ruled for about a century before a Chinese dynasty returned to power. The Ming dynasty then ruled until 1644 when the conquering Manchus took over. It was in the Manchu period, between 1644 and 1912, that European and American traders expanded their activity, and with the support of their governments marked out spheres of influence.

The first real East-West military conflict was the Opium War between China and England, fought for trade reasons and because Britain wanted to break down Chinese resistance to British influence. As a result of this war Hong Kong was ceded to Britain "in perpetuity," China was forced to pay an indemnity, five Chinese ports were opened to British residence and trade, and a moderate uniform tariff was arranged. The treaty also provided for extra-territorial jurisdiction in criminal cases, which meant that Britons accused of crimes in China were tried by British courts, not Chinese. Before long the United States and other powers got the same treaty rights as the British. A series of further wars brought further concessions to the Western nations, but resentment on the part of the Chinese people was felt increasingly, particularly toward foreign missionaries.

In 1870 there was a massacre at Tientsin arising out of problems created by foreign missionaries. A Chinese mob destroyed a Roman Catholic church and orphanage and killed some priests and nuns. The American Minister at Peking, Frederick E. Low, said: "One of the great underlying causes of the unrest of the Chinese which exhibits itself in hostility toward foreigners is to be found in the unwise action and illegal assumptions of the Roman Catholic missionaries; which assumptions have to a great extent the countenance and support of the French government."

Low indicated that many Protestant missionaries had a similar attitude and expressed his belief that problems would be overcome "if the missions in China could be conducted by really honest and sagacious men."[1]

Similarly George F. Seward while American Minister at Peking (1876-1880) found that the majority of the grievances with which the legation was called upon to deal concerned missionaries.[2]

An important problem in the Chinese-American relationship was

---

1 *The Far East*, by Paul H. Clyde, Prentice-Hall, 1948.

2 Ibid.

immigration. The migration of Chinese coolies to the United States, originally encouraged as a source of cheap labor, brought 75,000 to California by 1880. During the depression years charges were made that the Chinese, who would live on very little and work for low wages, were lowering the standard of living of Americans. Feeling ran high in some places, resulting in boycotts of Chinese labor and some murders of Chinese. Despite a Chinese-American treaty to the contrary, this country passed a law in 1832 suspending Chinese immigration for ten years, and later extended and amended it so as to make Chinese exclusion a national policy, making China the first country whose nationals were discriminated against in this way, and for a long time the only one.

China and Japan first came into conflict over Korea about 1875. Korea had been a Chinese dependency, but as a result of a Sino-Japanese war both powers agreed to withdraw troops from Korea and not to send them there again without notifying the other. China, however, continued to consolidate her power in Korea, though ninety percent of Korea's trade was with Japan. When China sent armies to suppress a revolt, Japan did likewise. The Japanese victory over China resulted in Chinese recognition of Korean independence, and Chinese cession to Japan of Formosa, the Pescadores, and the Liaotung Peninsula in South Manchuria. The intervention of Russia, Germany and France forced the return of the Liaotung Peninsula, chiefly because of their desire to maintain their own interests in China and to avoid Japanese participation in the partition of China. The war itself lent impetus to the move to partition China, and by 1900 Britain had marked out the Yangtze Valley, Germany the Shantung area, Russia Manchuria and north China, and France parts of southern China adjacent to Indo-China.

During these years of partition the United States policy was one of asking no territory in China for itself but insisting that there should be an open door in China for all powers, with no special privilege for other nations that America could not share.

Anti-Foreign Revolt

The Boxer rebellion in 1900, an anti-foreign and anti-Christian revolt, was symptomatic of growing unrest in China. During it Russia occupied Manchuria, a move that was countered by the Anglo-Japanese alliance of 1902, aimed at preventing further Russian expansion in Asia. Another result was the weakening of the Manchu hold on China, preparing the way for the Sun Yat Sen revolution.

In the years preceding 1911, sentiment among intellectuals for reform or revolution grew, schools on the Western pattern were set up, military schools were established and a new spirit of militarism engendered. The Manchu Empress tried some political and constitutional reforms as well, and permitted the holding of a national assembly, but the beginning of a parliamentary program was not sufficient. Population pressure, famine, and rising taxes laid the foundations for the revolt, and after some fighting a Republic was proclaimed, a struggle for dominance began among various political factions, and until 1916 there was a period of confusion, with power

held largely by military leaders.

The first World War resulted in Germany's being driven out of the Far East and in the strengthening of Japan's hold. The Russian Revolution had temporarily weakened Russia, and Japan fell heir to her sphere of influence. The war left the United States, with its increased economic interest in the Far East, Japan's major rival.

Sun Yat Sen's Rise

In 1923 Sun Yat Sen's Kuomintang, one of China's political units in the struggle for power, began to collaborate with Russia with the aim of gaining political unity and independence for China. The Chinese Communist Party was admitted to membership in the Kuomintang and Michael Borodin, a Russian representative, reorganized the Kuomintang along the Soviet line of party discipline and a party program of action. By 1926 the Kuomintang had created a national government and a new army, and Chiang Kai-shek, a young general who had studied in a Chinese military academy and in Japanese military circles, and had taken a trip to Russia to study the Soviet system, was in charge of the Kuomintang armies. The Kuomintang then felt ready to attempt to unify China under its leadership, and its armies made rapid progress. In the course of the next year or so, however, a split developed between Communists and conservatives in the Kuomintang, and Chiang used force not only to suppress Communists but also against liberals, labor unions, students, and other elements who opposed him. By 1931, after a ceaseless battle against the Communists, who still controlled parts of China, and against some of the war lords, the Kuomintang had an organization covering most of China, and began to get rid of foreign concessions, extra-territoriality, and other evidences of Western imperialism.

In September, 1931, with the Mukden incident in Manchuria, Japan and China became involved in a war that was to last until the Japanese defeat by the United States in 1945, and was to spread throughout China. The war arose partly because of Chinese nationalism and China's claim to what she called the Three Eastern Provinces. Both Japan and Russia had wanted these provinces, and as Chinese influence began to expand Japan was prepared to fight to maintain her position. Furthermore the depression in the United States created unemployment in Japan, since much of Japan's trade was with this country. For economic reasons the Japanese army was willing for such an incident as Mukden to give the signal for military conquest of the rich resources of Manchuria.

As the war with Japan progressed it became evident that Russia's Asiatic interests would suffer if Japan were victorious, and in August, 1937, China and Russia signed a non-aggression pact. Also, under pressure of the fear of Japanese domination, Chiang and the Communists suspended hostilities so that both could fight the Japanese.

When the war closed in August, 1945, it was evident that the Nationalists had been weakened by war, factionalism within the Kuomintang, graft in the government, and inflation. Their armies were in the west and south when Japan surrendered, and the Communist armies were in the north ready to

take over that area from the Japanese. The United States moved Chiang's armies by air and sea to the northeast to confront the Communist armies.

Shortly after the surrender of Japan, Russia and China made a pact in which Russia recognized the Chinese Nationalists as the government of China. She gained the right to use Port Arthur and Dairen, and there was to be joint Chinese-Russian operation of the Chinese Eastern and the South Manchurian railways.

Attempt to Conciliate

In an attempt to avert a conflict between the Nationalists and Communists, President Truman sent General George C. Marshall to China, but the unification of such diverse elements did not prove possible. Marshall thought too much in military terms, like uniting the Communist and Nationalist armies with American equipment and training, and the United States displayed its partisanship by selling $800,000,000 in surplus war materials to the Nationalists.

The Nationalists and Communists continued to fight, the former aided by the United States and the latter by Russia. In the course of the next few years, the Communists were successful in driving the Nationalists out of China, and have consolidated their hold on the country by putting into practice desperately-needed land reforms. They were aided also, of course, by the fact that the Nationalists had become a symbol of corruption, repression and exploitation.

With the defeat of the Nationalists, the Chinese Communists negotiated an agreement with Soviet Russia and promptly began an anti-Western, chiefly anti-American, campaign.

Formosa

Formosa (Taiwan) became a part of the Chinese Empire in the second half of the 17th Century. For several hundred years before this Formosa had been under the influence of the Chinese, but it was not until after the 17th Century that Chinese immigration made it a predominantly Chinese land. The aborigines, now a very small percentage of the population, were pushed back into the hills.

Formosa passed into Japanese hands under the terms of the Treaty of Shimonoseki, which ended the war of 1894-95 between China and Japan. The inhabitants were difficult to pacify and uprisings were frequent during the first thirty years of Japanese rule.

The Japanese built roads, introduced machinery and developed hydroelectric power. Most of the island was geared to agriculture, since Japan wanted to be self-sufficient in its food supply. The Japanese reduced the use of opium, improved health standards, and introduced compulsory education. In other respects the rule of Formosa was similar to imperial rule in British, French, and Dutch colonies.

During the war, in December, 1943, when Churchill, Roosevelt and Chiang Kai-shek met in Cairo, they agreed "that all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China."

The inhabitants of Formosa remained Chinese, and when Japan was defeated in 1945 their Chinese liberators were greeted with enthusiasm. However, Kuomintang troops plundered its resources and

Chinese carpet baggers took over most of its industry, claiming that it was enemy property. Everything movable was taken to the mainland.

The situation became so bad that George Kerr, who served as American Vice Consul and Foreign Service officer there after the surrender, wrote in February, 1947: "The 6,500,000 Formosans found themselves in February, 1947, infinitely worse off than they had been under the Japanese for half a century. Harsh though they were, the Japanese had brought security and order, enlarged economic opportunity and enhanced standards of living. 'Liberation' and return to China had brought Formosans to the edge of rebellion."[3]

Refuge in Formosa

A revolt in February, 1947, was suppressed by the Kuomintang with about five thousand killed and additional thousands imprisoned. Thereafter, as the Kuomintang was pushed off the mainland, the island became the refuge of the Kuomintang armies and wealthy civilians. The United States, which had backed Chiang Kai-shek in his fight with the Chinese Communists, continued to give economic assistance to Formosa under the ECA program but indicated in January, 1950, that it had no intention "of utilizing its armed forces to interfere in the present situation." President Truman did, however, after the beginning of the war in Korea, order the Seventh Fleet to prevent any attack on Formosa from the Chinese mainland. At the same time he called upon the "Chinese government on Formosa to cease all air and sea operations against the mainland." For a time the blockade and bombings stopped, but after an interval were begun again.

The Chinese Communists, claiming that Formosa is Chinese territory, sent the following appeal to the United Nations on August 24, 1950:

> "This action on the part of the United States of America is a direct armed aggression on the territory of China and a total violation of the United Nations Charter. . . . On behalf of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China I now lodge this accusation with the United Nations Security Council and propose that, for the maintenance of international peace and security and for the upholding of the dignity of the United Nations Charter, the United Nations Security Council is obligated by its inalienable duties to condemn the United States Government for its criminal act in the armed invasion of the territory of China, and to take immediate measures to bring about the complete withdrawal of all the United States armed invading forces from Taiwan and from other territories belonging to China."

Any solution to this problem will depend on a solution to the whole Far Eastern power problem.

Tibet

Tibet has for centuries been a part of China, though in race, culture and history it is a separate land. From the 7th Century Buddhism has been a force in Tibet, and its monks eventually came to rule the country. The Dalai Lama is the ruling monk. In 1720 the Chinese invaded Tibet and made it, and later Nepal, a part of the Chinese empire.

During the 18th and 19th Centuries when Europeans were penetrating Asia there was little Euro-

[3] Far Eastern Survey, Institute for Pacific Relations, October 15, 1947.

pean contact with Tibet, whose trade was largely with her close neighbors. In 1904, however, chiefly out of fear that Russia would turn her attention to India and the British sphere in South Asia, Great Britain brought Tibet, with a little military effort, into the British sphere of influence. An agreement was reached, however, that gave China continued access to the country.

Chinese Troops Expelled

When the Chinese government changed hands and the Republic was being set up, Chinese troops were largely expelled from Tibet. Britain suggested a three-way agreement including herself, China and Tibet, but the Chinese refused. In 1914, Britain and Tibet agreed that the part of Tibet adjoining India was to be autonomous, although still technically a part of China.

After India achieved freedom from Britain, India maintained contact with Tibet and by agreement had troops guarding trade routes to Lhasa. In the fall of 1950, despite protests by India and an appeal by Tibet to the United Nations, Chinese troops invaded Tibet, asserting not only Chinese suzerainty but the right to interfere more directly in Tibetan affairs. The invasion took place despite the fact that Tibetan emissaries who were on the way to China via India had been given instructions to negotiate a peaceful settlement with China.

China looked upon the proposed negotiations with impatience and perhaps as a maneuver. The Tibetan mission had started for Peiping in June, 1950, but transit visas for Hong Kong were refused by the British, who feared the negotiations would end with Communist China getting Tibet. The Tibetans waited in India and had some talks with the Chinese Ambassador, but the talks broke down when China demanded that a token force of Chinese be stationed in Lhasa.

India's Position

India, while indicating her friendship for Tibet, has also affirmed her recognition of Chinese suzerainty over Tibet. However, she wants Tibet's historic internal autonomy preserved, and particularly deplored the military intervention just as the Tibetan emissaries, with British clearance, were setting out for Hong Kong and China.

Within Tibet there is some sympathy for the Chinese Communists. The New York *Times* of November 7, 1950, reported: "Intelligence available here (India) indicates that the masses of Tibetans, having known only exploitation by the Lamaistic Government, are willing, without reservations, to aid the Communists since from their viewpoint no change can be worse than the present regime." Another *Times* dispatch revealed that Tibet had recently imposed a heavy conscription program on its people and that the Cabinet was divided over the issue of full mobilization and military resistance.

While other powers expressed their disapproval or remained silent, Russian newspapers spoke of the invasion of Tibet as "a legitimate measure to complete the unification of the country and to secure peace and security." The United States Ambassador to India stated that the United States did not intend to intervene in Tibet

and considered the issue "one entirely for Tibet and China to decide."

Meanwhile the military and civil administration of Communist Southwest China issued a proclamation promising the people of Tibet regional autonomy and complete freedom to carry on their religion and traditions. All officials would remain at their posts and the Tibetan army would become a part of the Chinese defense system, the proclamation asserted.

Even if China does fulfill its promise of autonomy to Tibet, southern neighbors like India, Nepal and Assam may fear the use of Tibet as a jumping-off place for their invasion or penetration by guerrillas or armies.

Indo-China

South of China and east of Burma and Siam is Indo-China. In earlier centuries Indian settlers and culture entered from the south while Chinese immigrants and culture entered from the northeast. The north was at times a part of the Chinese empire.

European intervention began in the 16th Century, when Portuguese traders and missionaries arrived. In the 17th Century French traders and missionaries appeared, and from then until about 1910 France was expanding and consolidating its power in Indo-China. A French Catholic bishop and soldier-of-fortune, Pigneau de Behoine, aided the king of Cochin China against rebels in the hope of furthering religion and French expansion. As a result the first treaty between France and this southern tip of Indo-China, Cochin China, was signed in 1787. Napoleon III sent an expedition in 1858 against Annam, another section of Indo-China, and in 1862 France got a treaty from Annam opening some of its ports to French trade and ceding part of its territory. The following year another province, Cambodia, was made a French protectorate and in 1867 the remainder of Cochin China was annexed. By 1884 Annam was forced to become a protectorate. Then France demanded and obtained from Siam (now Thailand) territory which it organized as the protectorate of Laos. In 1887 all the territory under French control was brought together under a Governor General and a Council, and a trend toward full French rule begun. More territory held by Siam was ceded in 1904 and in 1907 to French Indo-China.

During the First World War thousands of natives were sent to Europe as soldiers and laborers. After the war, partly as a result of a growing nationalism, natives were given some share in their governments. Mining and other industries were established, roads, railroads, and canals were built and even a few schools were developed.

During the period between wars, nationalism was present but racial, cultural and language difficulties kept it weak. The Annamese regarded the Cambodians and Laotians as fit only to be subject nations, but were themselves divided. Despite the fact that it was not a great threat, the French cruelly suppressed the nationalist movement and dealt even more harshly with Communist groups. Partly as a result of this suppression, France could not hold the loyalty of the people when the Japanese invasion took place during World War II.

In March, 1945, before the end of the war in Europe or Asia, and with Indo-China still in the hands of the

Japanese, France promised partial self-government for Indo-China when Japan was defeated. To the natives, however, this meant that France intended to rule them again, and their strong and growing nationalism was unsatisfied by the prospect.

The leader of the nationalist forces and of the underground resistance movement during World War II was Ho Chi Minh, who had a Communist background, but showed signs of independence when his nationalist movement and Communist Party interests clashed. As leader of the resistance he was in a position, when Japan surrendered, to seize Hanoi and declare a republic, which he called Viet Nam. He forced the abdication of Emperor Bao Dai, a playboy who had collaborated with the Japanese during the occupation.

When the war ended Indo-China was occupied by Allied troops, and clashes between Viet Nam and French forces followed. In September, 1945, however, a truce was signed, and in March, 1946, France recognized the Viet Nam Republic as a free state within the French Indo-Chinese system and promised that after a plebiscite Cochin China would be included in Viet Nam. Instead, France set up Cochin China as a separate republic, and armed clashes again occurred between French and Viet Nam forces.

The French took this opportunity to return Bao Dai to power, placing him at the head of a puppet Viet Nam state with French military support. Since then the country has been occupied by unceasing war, with Ho Chi Minh, whose government is now called Viet Minh, gradually pushing the French back, in spite of support they receive from other countries. Great Britain has recognized the Bao Dai regime, and the United States has furnished considerable military aid to the French in Indo-China and has given economic aid in the sum of $23,000,000 to the Bao Dai regime.

In spite of this support, it appears likely that the French will lose Indo-China, whether driven out by a victorious Viet Minh or eased out by their puppet Viet Nam. A New York *Times* dispatch of November 9,1950, stated: "The great majority of the people of Viet Nam want full independence from France. . . . The surest way to political popularity in Viet Nam, even among Bao Dai Government members, is to strike an anti-French note."

Britain in Asia

A passing reference should be made to British influence in Asia. Originally the dominant European power because of its possession of India and Burma and its stake in China, Britain now holds only Hong Kong, the Malay Peninsula, and a part of Borneo. Ceylon, India and Pakistan, formerly British possessions, are now independent parts of the British Commonwealth of Nations. At the present time there is strong opposition to British rule only in Malaya. Britain got its foothold there with the purchase of Singapore in 1819 from the Sultan of Johore, and gradually extended its control over the rest of the peninsula that was not under Burmese or Siamese jurisdiction.

Today the British in Malaya are engaged in a campaign against Communist-led nationalist guerrillas whose aim is freedom from British rule.

Russia in Asia

Russia's relations with Asia are those not only of a European im-

perialist power but also of a powerful Asiatic neighbor. About three-fourths of Soviet Russia is in Asia, and the boundary between China and Russia is the longest land frontier between any two nations.

Ancient Conquest

The Russians have been in Asia a long time, having begun their expansion into Siberia in the 15th and 16th Centuries and reached the Pacific about 1640. A major interest in her conquest of Siberia was the fur trade, but before long the Russians also expanded southward where they could engage in other trade, plunder the people, and exact tribute. In moving south, however, they came into conflict with the Chinese, and were defeated by them. The resulting treaty of Nerchinsk, in 1689, established the Chinese-Russian boundary and granted the Russians trade privileges. During the ensuing years, while China was busy with conquests in Tibet, Indo-China and Mongolia, Russia expanded its trade with China and sent ambassadors there.

When the Western Europeans began to penetrate the Chinese seacoast, Russia, not to be outdone, violated the treaty of Nerchinsk by moving into the Amur Valley in what is now northern Manchuria and eastern Siberia, and by annexing Sakhalin Island. In the middle of the 19th Century, along with Britain, France and the United States, she gained further trade concessions, and took important territory bordering the Pacific, including the valuable port of Vladivostok.

After the Sino-Japanese War, Russia lent China the money to pay the cash indemnity to Japan. Russia then began negotiations with China for the right to construct a railway across central Manchuria. An agreement was signed in 1896 by which the Russians got the right to construct and manage what they called the Chinese Eastern Railway, and in return agreed to come to China's defense if she were threatened by Japan. After eighty years, the railway was to become Chinese property without payment, but if China desired it, she could buy it after thirty-six years.

The railway was defended by Russian guards and was her means of economic penetration into Manchuria. In 1898 Russia added to her hold on China by getting a 25-year lease of the southern end of the Liaotung Peninsula and the right to connect the Chinese Eastern Railway with Dairen. Russia now could connect Moscow not only with Vladivostok but with Dairen, an ice-free port.

Meanwhile, Russia and Japan had become rivals over Korea and their interests clashed in other parts of China. Eventually this rivalry erupted into the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-5, with Japan taking over the Liaotung Peninsula and gaining the ascendancy in Korea, while Russia agreed to evacuate Manchuria except for the railway concession.

In 1905 the United States gave its approval to Japanese suzerainty in Korea. American sympathies had been with Japan in the war against Russia, and the treaty of peace was signed at Portsmouth, New Hampshire. Japan proceeded to construct a South Manchurian railway and to gain a sphere of influence in South Manchuria while recognizing Russia's sphere in North Manchuria.

In agreements made in 1913 and 1915 with China, Russia became nominally an equal of China in

Mongolia. China was forced to recognize Mongolian autonomy, though it remained under Chinese suzerainty, and China agreed to consult Russia on all political and territorial problems in that area. In practice, however, Russia kept the Chinese and Mongols divided and actually ruled the land.

In 1919 and 1920, after the Russian Revolution, Soviet Russia told China that it had given up all Czarist conquests in Asia, that it renounced all such special privileges as extra-territoriality, and that it would hand over to China without payment the Chinese Eastern Railway, which the Chinese had already taken. In 1924 an agreement was actually signed by which Russia gave up extra-territoriality and its share in the Boxer indemnity, but the Soviets did not make good on most of their other promises. In 1921 Russian armies re-established control of Outer Mongolia and some other sections of Russian Asia, and Russia reasserted her claim to the Chinese Eastern Railway.

Russia and China were alternately friendly and hostile, while Russia supported the Chinese Communists but united with the Kuomintang when Japan seemed to threaten China or Russian interests there. In 1937 Russia and China concluded a non-aggression treaty, and the Communists and the Kuomintang again united, after years of intermittent fighting, against the Japanese. After the signing of the Nazi-Soviet pact and the outbreak of war in Europe, however, Russia reduced its shipments to China. In April, 1941, Russia and Japan signed a neutrality pact that lasted until 1945 when, shortly before Japan surrendered, Russia entered the war against her in an effort to reassert her interests in Asia. As a result of the secret agreements made at Yalta and confirmed by a treaty with China in August, 1945, Russia recovered everything it lost to Japan in the 1904-5 war, together with the cutting of all Chinese ties with Outer Mongolia, when the war ended. In addition, Russia and the United States agreed to a compromise by which Russia accepted the surrender of the Japanese in Korea north of the 38th parallel and the United States did the same in South Korea.

With the success of the Communist forces in China in 1949, Russia and the Communist government of China concluded an agreement of mutual defense against any powers that might aid Japan in regaining her influence in Asia, a reference aimed at the United States. Russia and her new ally China were thus in control of all the Asiatic mainland except the Indian subcontinent, the southeastern countries, and a part of Korea.

All that remained in the realm of immediate possibilities was Communist conquest of Korea, Tibet and Indo-China. Russia, as yet not involved in direct military intervention, has confined herself to aiding the regime she set up in North Korea.

Korea

Korea, as we have seen, was for a time a Chinese dependency, in 1885 became in effect a joint protectorate of China and Japan, and as a result of the 1894-95 Sino-Japanese war, became nominally independent. After the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-5 Korea became a protectorate of Japan despite the plea of the Korean emperor that the United States use its good

offices to keep Korea free. Korea's annexation by Japan was proclaimed in 1910, and it remained in Japanese hands until Japan's defeat in 1945.

Nonviolent Revolt

Following the end of World War I Korean patriots on March 1, 1919, staged a nonviolent revolt in connection with the signing and public reading of their declaration of independence. The Koreans hoped that the victorious powers at Versailles, but especially the United States because of Woodrow Wilson's "fourteen points," would aid them in their effort at freedom. No such help was forthcoming, and their movement was cruelly suppressed by the Japanese.

The Korean independence movement did not die, and largely as a result of the work of exiled Korean patriots the goal of independence became more generally accepted. In November, 1943, at the Cairo Conference of Roosevelt, Churchill and Chiang Kai-shek, the goal of independence was made a matter of record, and at Potsdam in July, 1945, Russia gave formal agreement to the Cairo statement.

Shortly after the Japanese surrender Russia and the United States, in a December, 1945, conference in Moscow, agreed that a provisional regime should be set up in Korea preparatory to holding elections. Subsequently, when the details were up for consideration, the Russians wanted to bar from future planning all Korean political parties that would not agree to making Korea a temporary trusteeship. All political parties except the Communist opposed trusteeship, in favor of outright independence, and the United States would not agree to the Russian proposal.

After months of fruitless negotiation the United States referred the problem to the UN General Assembly. The Assembly, over Soviet protests, decided to send a commission to Korea to arrange for, and observe, the holding of elections. The Commission was refused entry to North Korea, and in May, 1948, proceeded to hold elections in South Korea. The Assembly that was elected chose Syngman Rhee as President.

Worsening Relations

In December, 1948, Russia, having established a one-party regime and trained an army and police force, withdrew her troops from North Korea, leaving behind a military mission said to number about 3,500. American troops stayed on in South Korea until July, 1949, leaving a military mission of about 500 for the training of a South Korean army.

The Syngman Rhee government took on a police state character, suppressing newspapers, jailing students and trade unionists, and otherwise getting rid of those who criticized the regime. In an election held in May, 1949, the Rhee party kept only some forty seats out of the 210 in the National Assembly. Rhee himself remained President, since he had been elected in 1948 to a four-year term.

In August, 1949, and again several months later, there were border clashes when armed North Koreans crossed the boundary. On June 7, 1950, the North Koreans by radio proposed elections throughout Korea following the meeting of a proposed Consultative Council. A representative of the UN Com-

mission went into North Korea on June 10 to get the text of the proposal, but the next day when three North Koreans crossed the border carrying copies for Southern political leaders, they were arrested.

The North made several additional proposals for unification and election, all of which rejected UN supervision, and all of which were turned down by South Korea. On June 25, North Korea launched an invasion across the 38th parallel.

The next day the United Nations Security Council adopted a United States resolution calling for a cease-fire in Korea and for withdrawal of North Korean troops to the 38th parallel, and urging UN members to "render every assistance to the United Nations in the execution of this resolution." The United States chose to consider this as a mandate for armed intervention, and the next day President Truman announced that he had ordered U.S. troops and ships into combat in support of South Korean forces. The United States then introduced a resolution into the UN recommending that UN members use armed force in repelling the invasion of the North Koreans, and it was adopted.

United Nations forces, consisting largely of American and South Korean troops, were gradually pushed down into a pocket at the bottom of South Korea, but the tide turned in the fall when UN troops made a landing on the west coast above the North Korean lines. They quickly drove the North Korean troops out of South Korea and, after a brief hesitation, followed them across the 38th parallel and pursued them farther and farther north.

The Indian government and its UN delegate, Sir Benegal Rau, opposed the push into North Korea by U.S. and other UN troops, warning repeatedly that China would certainly consider her security menaced by an advance north of the 38th parallel. Sir Benegal and other spokesmen for the Indian government indicated that their belief that China would intervene in such a case was based on information from the highest sources in China, which was taken to be Mao Tse-tung.

Toward the end of November it seemed that the war must end very shortly with a North Korean surrender, and General MacArthur predicted that he would have American troops home by Christmas. UN troops were driving north rapidly, and were approaching the Manchurian border. Other UN nations were apprehensive, however, that China would resent such a near approach by the troops of countries that refused to recognize the Chinese Communist government and had constantly aided Chiang Kai-shek against it, and urged that a neutral buffer strip be set up along the border and that UN troops should not advance all the way to the border. Manchuria is China's only center of heavy industries, and is exceptionally rich in minerals such as coal, gold, tungsten, copper, iron and zinc, particularly in the Yalu River region along the border. The Yalu River dam, one of the biggest in the world, supplies power to this huge industrial region as well as to northern Korea.

After crossing into North Korea, UN troops had begun to encounter Chinese "volunteers" fighting with the North Koreans, certainly an indication that China considered herself concerned in the situation; but General MacArthur and his in-

telligence strongly advocated pushing on to the Manchurian border, and insisted that the Chinese would not come into the war.

Elusive Victory

On Thanksgiving Day, November 25, UN forces began the final push to the border, and for a couple of days met no resistance; then on a cold, moonlight night Chinese troops poured down from the mountains and overwhelmed them. Within the space of a few weeks, the huge numbers of poorly equipped Chinese troops had driven back the UN forces, with great losses, south of the 38th parallel again, where the front stabilized temporarily. The United States retaliated by pushing through the United Nations a resolution branding China an aggressor in Korea, in spite of further, often-reiterated warnings by India that such action would close the door, which just then seemed promisingly open, to negotiations with China for an end to the war in Korea.

As a result of the day-after-day record of American bombing and burning of Korean villages, American popularity in the Orient waned. The *United States News* of September 22, 1950, reported that Americans dared not wander around alone in the native quarters of Pusan, the main U.S. base. In India and elsewhere in Asia the unpopularity of the United States was growing as news of bombed Korean villages was published.[4]

Reports like the following seem to indicate that even former South Korean sympathizers are being alienated: "These embittered people are now complaining that the treatment they are receiving at the hands of the Korean civil and military police and right wing youth organizations is as harsh as that meted out by the Communists during their occupation."[5]

Senator Ralph Flanders of Vermont has declared that "The 'get tough' policy has failed," and diagnoses the failure as follows:

> At the present moment the active military defense of the Korean sector is engaging us. The attack was unexpected in time and unexpectedly strong. When we consider it, we begin to realize that this attack may be repeated indefinitely around this enormous line of containment. Russia with her internal position can make trouble here, there, or elsewhere at will. She takes the offensive. We will be rushing frantically to the defensive, perhaps 10,000 miles from where the last attack was made.
>
> There are more serious problems involved in this than the simple problem of having men enough, resources enough, and transportation facilities enough to respond to any fire alarm at any unknown point at any unexpected time. This Korean situation begins to outline a pattern of economic and moral disaster. On the economic side, Russia has not engaged her own forces and only a small part of her own resources. If she can repeat this strategy over and over, she can wear us down while maintaining her own strength. She will weaken her puppet states one after the other as she weakens us, but she herself will remain strong. The prospect is disheartening.
>
> The moral aspects are not less so. As a result of this Korean campaign, we find ourselves ruining the people we set out to protect.[6]

If the United States were to rush its forces and resources to every

---

[4] New York *Times*, August 13, 1950.

[5] New York *Times*, November 17, 1950.

[6] Congressional Record, August 2, 1950.

point where Communist satellites or suspected sympathizers try to expand, the United States would either seriously undermine its strength, or militarist elements would insist on beginning a "preventive" war with Russia in the hope that such a war would make unnecessary many peripheral wars.

Can Containment Work?

The policy of containment rests on the assumption that the whole world must line up either with Russia or with the United States. If this assumption is accepted China and Asia will be driven irrevocably into the Russian orbit, for they have had enough of being satellites of the West. India's independence, Titoism in Yugoslavia, and similar tendencies at work elsewhere reveal that there are people and nations who do not want to be contained by either of the two great powers.

The policy of containment does not offer hope to the peoples of Asia. They will accept communism every time rather than be destroyed by American bombs or kept in subjection by the anti-Communist elements that we support, but who have for years been their ruthless masters. Nor will the "Voice of America" or other propaganda for political democracy appeal to Asia if it is merely talk. Asia can be won for democracy only by action—action in the direction of economic democracy, of political democracy, and of social democracy; action that demonstrates faith in the worth of each individual. Such action would provide such stark contrast to the best that communism can offer that Asia would not be long in making a sound choice.

Proposed Policy

What then should be our policy in Asia? It can be summed up in five ideas: freedom, food, trade, technical assistance, and peace.

1. **We should help Asia free herself of all imperialism.** For the United States this should mean that we would cease to help the colonial powers to maintain their hold on subject peoples, throwing the weight of our influence into getting them to grant freedom. Where such powers refuse, we should support native movements for freedom. Such support will mean much to the world and all the people in it, even though it may seem temporarily to demand opposing friendly European governments and aiding revolutionists whose political loyalties may be alien to ours. National freedom is essential if natives of colonial lands are ever to gain the experience and political maturity that is needed for full participation in world politics and in any world government. Moreover, so long as some powers insist on maintaining colonies, others, for moral or political reasons, will try to free them, and the situation will present a perpetual potential source of war.

Furthermore, there is every evidence that movements for independence are gaining in strength, and that freedom for oppressed nations is only a matter of time. The real question is whether it will come by long and deadly fighting with its consequent bitterness, or whether it will come quickly and with as little violence as possible. In the latter event, nationalism and national existence could be made merely a step toward membership in a world society, in-

stead of a source of intensified, prolonged and bitter struggle.

It is not enough, however, to end colonial rule if the United States or any other power intends to control by virtue of economic power. American aid to Asia should be aid given because of need, rather than a device to strengthen our power position there. Similarly, American investors who assert their right to high profits because they take risks should be warned that if they invest in Asia they must take their chances as do natives engaged in business, and not depend upon the economic or military power of the United States to defend their investments if they are endangered.

Fight Famine

2. **The United States should use its tremendous food surpluses to fight famine** wherever it rears its ugly head. Such a use of surplus food would relieve dreadful suffering and have spiritual by-products in stimulating friendliness on the part of giver and receiver. Hunger and malnutrition are causes of unrest and dissatisfaction, which breed revolution and war. Their results are not easily predictable. Those who assume that by withholding grain from potential enemy nations we can stimulate a revolution against the regime in power are likely to be mistaken. It is more probable that starvation will become a potent factor in further alienating that nation from the nation with food surpluses.

Famine anywhere in the world is a cancer that may easily jeopardize life everywhere.

3. **Technical assistance and world planning are needed** to rebuild soil and conserve it from erosion, to reclaim deserts and to plant in the proper places the most appropriate crops. Surplus food alone will never solve the problem of hunger. Technical and financial assistance are needed for the proper storage and distribution of food. Lest this be seen as a problem only for Asia or other non-Western lands, we have only to remember the millions of potatoes destroyed recently in the United States because of inadequate planning in planting and in distributing.

Technical assistance must extend also into the field of locating and exploiting the mineral and other raw materials of the world, in harnessing the water and other power resources, and in industrializing appropriate areas. That such a program is needed in Asia is obvious. It has more people to feed, clothe, transport, house, and give other essentials of living to, and with the possible exception of Africa it has the lowest standard of living in the world. It has also tremendous unused and unknown resources.

The United States can and should take the leadership in the United Nations in setting up a cooperative technical assistance program on the scale that would be needed in Asia.

4. **Trade is necessary for the welfare of all,** since we live in an interdependent world. Nations in need of agricultural and industrial machinery are in need of trade; and the nations providing the machinery need the mineral and other resources that come from trade. There are real problems such as dollar surpluses, refusal to trade with potential enemies, bloc purchasing, control of trade by national governments, and high tariffs that need to be overcome be-

fore needs of people everywhere can be met. Asia in particular suffers from lack of trade with the United States. It does not have dollars, since much of Asia is in the "potential enemy" class and because of tariff and other trade restrictions.

Indispensable Peace

5. Finally, Asia needs peace. Its achievement is partly dependent on a solution to the other problems mentioned above, and partly on resolving the power struggle now being waged by Russia and the United States. There seems to be little chance of resolving this struggle quickly insofar as it is ideological in nature, but it need not involve Asia or the world in war if total world disarmament can be achieved. The achievement of disarmament is dependent not only on agreement among the nations, but also on the degree of confidence that nations can establish prior to such an agreement. Such confidence is often established by unilateral action. For example, the United States could eliminate much of the fear of its intentions if it were to free all of its territorial possessions, if it were to place its islands not yet capable of self-government under a *real* United Nations trusteeship (at present the United States rules some areas for the United Nations, thus making trusteeship a moral cloak for imperialism), and/or if it were to place the Panama Canal and other strategic areas under United Nations control. Likewise if the United States were to throw its whole weight behind the "disarmament" clause of the Japanese constitution, aiding those elements in Japan who want complete disarmament and military neutrality rather than, as it is doing, planning Japan's speedy rearmament and use as a base for the United States, confidence in our motives in the Far East must be greatly increased. Of course it would mean withdrawing our occupation personnel, disbanding the Japanese army we are already building, and abandoning fortifications we have said we wanted. In the Philippines, the United States would have to abandon the military bases we insisted on holding when we granted "freedom" to those islands.

If on a world scale the United States by its actions were to strengthen the United Nations and to become a symbol of peace and freedom in the world, the people of Asia would prefer American friendship to Russian friendship, unless Russia also chose to abandon its control and its armaments in Asia. If Russia chose to try to control Asia under these circumstances the world would then witness an Asiatic revolt directed against Russian imperialism. If Russia on the other hand were to recognize the new reality as a result of changed U. S. policy in Asia, and try to compete with the United States for the good will of Asia, the world would have moved to the point where total disarmament would be the logical next step. In the modern world if one great nation were, by its unilateral action for peace, to become the symbol of hope to people everywhere, no other major power could, by maintaining "armed strength," hope to hold the loyalty or support of those people. Armaments then will cease to be tools for improving a nation's power position. They will be a liability—the symbol of everything the people want to reject.

HOW MANY Pacifists Are There in America?

More than we realize, that's sure. Every once in a while somebody joins the Fellowship with the words: "I'd have joined long ago if I had known anything about it."

The problem is how to reach these solitary pacifists, and the others who might be pacifists with a little help. The meetings, the letters-to-the-editor, and other activities sponsored by FOR groups or individuals are all attempts to meet that problem.

We Have Another Idea

The FOR Literature Department, always trying to think up ways of getting people to read its publications, has come up with a new idea. It's not THE answer, but maybe it's AN answer. See what you think!

The "Recruit by Mail" Plan

The plan is simple enough.

All it involves is sending some pacifist literature in three mailings, at intervals of a week, to a selected list of people in your community.

It would be something like the Peace Roll Call, except that it would not be primarily a money-raising plan, and it usually would not go to the same people.

Here's how it would work:

One or more FOR members, or an FOR group or cell, would decide on a list of names—anywhere from 10 to 1,000—to whom to send the mailings, and a date to start.

Suppose the date is May 1. On that day you put in the mail the first of the three mailings. It contains one flyer and a brief note. A week later the second mailing goes out, containing two leaflets. A week after that (May 15) the third and last mailing is sent out, with one leaflet and a concluding letter.

Easy enough, isn't it?

Will It Work?

Maybe it will work and maybe it won't. At the very least it will start some people thinking, and perhaps tell us whether there are many unaffiliated pacifists around. At best, it might do a great deal more than that.

Will you try it? You'll find the details elsewhere in these pages. Use the coupon to order the materials—or, if you don't like to deface your FELLOWSHIP, order on a separate piece of paper. Or send for samples of the materials first, if you wish.

What Will It Cost?

The materials will be sent free; if you wish to pay for them, that will be welcome. Approximate cost of each item is indicated.

The principal expense to you, aside from time, will be the cost of envelopes and postage. Three mailings sent to ten people each by first class mail would cost about $1.05; by third class about 75 cents.

What Goes in the Mailings

Mailing No. 1: (a) A short letter, pointing out that there is "another way" than the one most people hear about, and that you are sending some literature about it. This will be printed on a Fellowship letterhead with room for your own address. (b) A copy of the flyer "Is Peace a Bad Word?" (Approximate cost: 5c per set)

Mailing No. 2: (a) The leaflet "Pacifism and the Human Spirit" and (b) the *Fellowship* reprint "Calculated Risk." (Approximate cost: 8c per set)

Mailing No. 3: (a) A copy of "You Asked about the FOR" and (b) a very brief note inviting inquiries and offering further information. (Approximate cost: 10c per set)

In any of these you can make any substitutions you wish. Writing your own letters will make them seem more personal, but it can become pretty tedious. For possible substitutions, see the November, 1950, issue of *Fellowship*.

Take These 6 Steps

1. Decide whether to act as an individual or with a group.

2. List the people you are going to send the mailings to: interested acquaintances; educational, religious, political leaders; the members of a church or labor union; perhaps even a cross-section of the public taken from the telephone book or sent via a rural delivery route.

3. Decide on materials to send, and order these (or prepare them) well in advance. It would be a good idea to address the envelopes in advance, too.

4. On May 1 (or whatever date you have chosen) send out the first mailing. Send the other two mailings at weekly intervals.

5. Be prepared to answer without delay any inquiries that come in.

6. *Please* report results to the national office, including names of any persons who should be written to from the national or a regional office, and those who want to join the FOR, subscribe to *Fellowship*, or contribute.

Use This Coupon to Order

(or order separately)

I (our group) have decided to try the Recruit-by-Mail campaign, beginning _____ (*date*). Please send the following materials.

I (we) enclose $_____ to help cover the cost.

_____ *Letter No. 1*

_____ *Is Peace a Bad Word?*

_____ *Pacifism and the Human Spirit*

_____ *Calculated Risk*

_____ *You Asked About the FOR*

_____ *Letter for No. 3*

NAME _____

(please print)

ADDRESS _____

The Pendle Hill Reader

Edited by Herrymon Maurer
With an introduction by Elton Trueblood

Here are brought together some very pertinent and interesting materials on the spiritual life which have heretofore been available only in pamphlet form. The authors vary from Arnold Toynbee, famous historian, to Emil Fuchs, a little-known professor of theology in Germany. Rufus Jones and Thomas Kelly have outstanding material which has never before appeared in book form. Douglas Steere, Howard Brinton, Gilbert Kilpack and Dora Willson are the other contributors.

$2.75

The Best of Dick Sheppard

Edited and with an introduction by Halford E. Luccock

Here are letters, talks, sermons, articles from the pen and from the heart of the famous H. R. L. "Dick" Sheppard. This book takes the place of a number of compilations in England and brings to American readers the essence of a man they know by reputation and now know directly. Dr. Luccock has wri a biographical sketch and appreci as a preface.

$2

Morals Since 1900

By Gerald Heard

"No book more important is likely t published this year. The author's pre is that the world in this day countena moral values and applications of m laws that would not have been pos 50 years ago. He tells how these m values have changed under the pres of technological developments, the applications of force. Here, surely, e in 1951, is one book that every thi and student should read."—*San An Express*

$3

Coming March 28

Strengthening The Spiritual Li

By Nels F. S. Ferre

A simple and direct guide to the votional life.

$1

at your bookseller

HARPER & BROTHERS, New York 16, N. Y.